DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 040 SP 027 291

AUTHOR Fox, G. Thomas, Jr.; And Others
TITLE Collaborating: Lessons Learned from Experience.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Feb 86
NOTE 64p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Communication Problems; *Cooperative Programs; *Program Attitudes; *Staff Development; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teaching Conditions; Teaching Experience; Teamwork

ABSTRACT

This monograph was prepared by a group having many years' experience with the Teacher Corps and the effective establishment of partnerships between K-12 schools and postsecondary schools, colleges, and departments of education. An evaluation is presented of circumstances that help or hinder collaboration between colleges of education and schools in improving staff development and teachers' work conditions. A number of college of education and school district procedures are cited that currently hamper growth in the collaboration procedure. Among suggestions for improvement is a strong plea for redistribution and reassignment of the missions and responsibilities of schools and colleges of education. It is pointed out that there are difficulties in collaborative action when professors in schools of education maintain an aloofness which effectively isolates them from the "hands-on" experience of teachers in schools. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Collaborating:

ED267040

SP027 291

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Lessons Learned from Experience

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Imig

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

COLLABORATING:

LESSONS LEARNED FROM EXPERIENCE

G. Thomas Fox, Jr.
Leo Anglin
Doris Fromberg
Michael Grady

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036

February 1986

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to express our appreciation to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education for supporting this study. Vivian Cooper's and Sharon Givens's persistence and editorial expertise were extremely helpful in completing the project. We especially want to recognize and acknowledge Dr. James Steffensen, National Institute of Education, for his ongoing guidance, inspiration, and encouragement for this project.

G. Thomas Fox
Leo W. Anglin
Doris Fromberg
Michael Grady

This material does not necessarily reflect the views of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. AACTE is printing the document to stimulate discussion, study, and experimentation in teacher education and to foster the spirit of collaboration with schools.

Printed in the United States of America

Standard Book Number: 0-89333-040-X

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

FOREWORD v

PREFACE vii

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER ONE: Synopsis of the Five Lessons 3

CHAPTER TWO: Professional Context for This Report 7

CHAPTER THREE: Our Study of Collaboration 11

CHAPTER FOUR: Samples of Profiles, Vignettes, and Dialogue from Our Deliberative Study 16

CHAPTER FIVE: LESSON ONE
Collaboration Must Be Both Personal and Institutional 24

CHAPTER SIX: LESSON TWO
A Venture Educator Roles Must Be Established 28

CHAPTER SEVEN: LESSON THREE
Institutional Barriers Must Be Reduced 33

CHAPTER EIGHT: LESSON FOUR
Educational Missions and Work Responsibilities Must Be Redistributed 41

CHAPTER NINE: LESSON FIVE
The Four Lessons Must Be Combined into an Effective Strategy 50

REFERENCES 52

FOREWORD

What did participants in the federal programs of the 1970s learn that is relevant to improving teachers' professional development and working conditions in the 1980s? Answers you may find useful are in this report. During the 1970s, Tom Fox of the University of Wisconsin at Madison was involved with one such program--Teacher Corps--as a planning and evaluation consultant with the national program staff. The other three authors were project directors: Leo Anglin, Associate Dean of the College of Education at Kent State University; Doris Fromberg, Professor of Elementary Education and Director of Early Childhood Education at Hofstra University, and Michael Grady, Chairperson of the Department of Communications at St. Louis University.

The diversity of campuses and educational environments offered a breadth of vision that enhances this report, which evaluates the circumstances that help or hinder collaboration between colleges of education and schools in improving staff development and teachers' work conditions. Although the focus of the education mission has changed since the 1970s, the need for collaboration is greater now than ever.

Educators will appreciate the way the authors have pinpointed a number of college of education and school district procedures that currently hamper growth. Not surprisingly, they found that a number of such restrictions are caused by operating procedures, but they did not stop with mere identification. They offer suggestions for improvement that vary from the easy-to-achieve to those that undoubtedly will be more difficult to implement. Among their suggestions is a strong plea for redistribution and reassignment of the missions and responsibilities of our schools and colleges of education. The team is particularly sensitive to the difficulties of collaborative action when professors in schools of education maintain an aloofness which effectively isolates them from the "hands-on" experiences of teachers in schools.

One of the team's concerns is that educators might think collaboration could be implemented successfully through joint institutional efforts alone. They reflect that some of their best results with Teacher Corps work might never have occurred if they had not been "dwelling" in the schools. While doing so, they had the opportunity for immediate feedback, were able to get on-site knowledge about teacher priorities and frustrations. They also discovered that many of the "goodies" which may seem almost routine in a school of education environment, such as professors' opportunities for publication and participation in the educational enrichment of national conferences, should be extended to those who teach in the schools.

A new education personnel position is recommended: "venture educator." The person who would have this job title would serve as a mediator or catalyst and have responsibilities quite similar to those the business world recognizes as belonging to a venture manager. In each case the person is brought in as an outside consultant who analyzes the problems, then stays with the

organization until the problems are resolved. The venture educator requires a special expertise in the educational arena and must have a thorough understanding of problems and possible solutions within the educational framework. While the creation of this position is recommended strongly as a way of dealing with numerous educational problems, the authors warn that it is far from being a panacea for the improvement of the staff development and teacher working conditions. There also must be many other steps taken.

One about which they speak strongly is the need to reduce barriers to change at the university level. Routine procedures account for a number of these and would be easier to break down than procedural barriers. It can be as simple as providing greater accuracy for course descriptions in college of education catalogs to allowing more time flexibility than what currently is limited by arbitrary arrangements. There is a need to cut the bureaucratic blizzard of paperwork currently required for joint educational efforts between college of education professors and school faculties. There also should be an awareness of the fact that additional supplies and materials may be required by joint efforts than what may appear to be sufficient at the beginning of the project.

When it comes to procedural barriers, Fox, Fromberg, Anglin and Grady warn that these present far more complex problems. Even so, they recommend that greater status be given to those professors who deal directly with schools and student teachers, and to those collaborative activities which increase educational responsiveness to the school. They also suggest that more time be allotted to the on-site assistance to local teachers, which Tom Fox considers can be implemented best by periods of "dwelling" in the actual schools.

All four authors had experiences which led them to see a greater need for flexibility in funding categories. Too often, once allocations had been granted by a school board, it became extremely difficult, if not impossible, to return to the board and have the categories revised. In this case, the authors are making a plea for allocation of resources such as placement and use of people or released time to be applied as the different needs arise and dynamic changes take place. They admit that this is a matter which requires the attention of schools of education and schools alike.

It also is necessary to emphasize the need to encourage staff development in the education of school administrators, which they may not have had in the past. Without an understanding of why this development is necessary, administrators are likely to be far less concerned about it than something else they consider of higher priority.

We believe that you will find a number of interesting and possibly controversial concepts in this report by Tom Fox, Doris Fromberg, Leo Anglin and Mike Grady.

Robert L. Saunders
President, American Association of
Colleges for Teacher Education

January 1986

PREFACE

The study for this report was begun in October 1981. Since then the National Commission on Excellence in Education report, A Nation at Risk, the Goodlad study, and the Carnegie report on high schools have generated considerable public attention to education. This increased public attention has produced new conditions for working educators.

Educators are finding their work to be more in the public spotlight. The general attention given to A Nation at Risk, the balanced praise and concern of the Carnegie study, and the Goodlad study have made it possible for educators to speak to a more informed, more interested public. Even if the attention has been raised by concern and criticism of an educational system that we are responsible for creating, the possibility of addressing an interested public audience has improved our work conditions. We feel we are involved in an important public enterprise. That adds considerably to our sense of value, especially those of us who work so invisibly in colleges of education.

Colleges of education have received some attention in these reports, but the potential for collaboration between schools and universities has received more. The Carnegie report, mildly but directly, states that universities in general are partly responsible for teachers' poor work conditions. It suggests that universities' professional separation from schools is partly responsible for some of the problems noted in the high schools visited. The implication is that more attention to the high school and the university would help.

The lessons we have learned extend the notion of interaction. Cooperation between universities and schools, we found, requires institutional assistance, a new institutional role within the university, reduction of university operational policies that restrict the possibilities for school-university interactions, and a redefinition of institutional missions and responsibilities, including those of university colleges of education.

The National Commission, in referring to teacher preparation as the "Mickey Mouse" of education, suggests more preparatory work in school classrooms and recommends that added responsibilities and support be provided to the education of experienced teachers. Although these few references to the role of teacher education are largely forgotten in the focus on student performance and school capability, it is implied that colleges of education can do their work better and can help in the continuing education of teachers. Our lessons go beyond these nearly conflicting notions of negligence and improvement. We suggest that the entire education profession must be considered critically and its full range of institutions reformed if the quality of schooling is to be significantly improved.

The Goodlad study is one of the best examples of the challenge facing university and school cooperation. Goodlad, a former school of education dean, uses university means to focus criticism almost entirely on the schools in the name of research. We do not doubt the conclusions nor the evidence and

logic used to reach the conclusions; what we find significant in this study is the comfortable distinction maintained between researcher and researched, between the object of educational inquiry--the schools--and the producer of educational inquiry--the colleges of education. It is a distinction we find related to the problems schools have in improving their capacities to educate. Schools must have a greater share in self-educating tasks such as research. It is not surprising to us, then, that Goodlad, the former dean, has less to say about the role of colleges of education than either Boyer in High School or the National Commission on Excellence in A Nation at Risk.

Not all has changed. Much that is occurring in the public view of education could have been anticipated by educators several years ago when the evidence for these recent reports was being analyzed. When we began our study, for example, we knew that colleges of education would have to cooperate more with schools and that rhetoric was not going to be enough when confronted with public criticism. We believed that colleges of education and their practices of teacher education were particularly vulnerable to public criticism, as well as to the professional criticism of teachers, and that the work conditions of teachers simply had to be improved if the education experienced by students was to be made more vital.

What we really understood, as we took on this responsibility to reflect upon our experiences, was that most of the critical professional attention would continue to be on the schools. That has not changed. The best research specialists, educational reformers, and expert consultants always have focused on the schools. With two million teachers and 45 million students, classrooms are where the action is. More to the point, we are all in the educational field to support classroom teaching and quality learning. Thus, we are not surprised that John Goodlad of UCLA, or Ernest Boyer of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and the various university members of the National Commission on Excellence in Education relegated to colleges of education only a partial relationship to the preparation of teachers and little if any relationship to improving the work conditions of teachers.

We remain disappointed and concerned that too few voices are being raised about the potential for leadership by colleges of education in the subsequent professional and public debates on educational reform. We suspect that most educational researchers, teacher educators, curriculum developers, educational consultants, and experts hope to benefit from these calls for school reforms. Our separation from schools removes us from being seen as a part of the problem and makes us a potential part of the solution. Most of us in colleges of education expect to gain from these critical studies and the public apprehension about school performance.

We seem to need to stay in the background, to be called from the wings at appropriate times to practice our expertise. Although a few recent reports have emphasized the importance of teacher education and staff development to the professional image of teaching, and reforms and changes periodically have been suggested for the practices of teacher education, colleges of education remain relatively unattached to recommended school reforms. The lengthening of the school year, for example, has been discussed without reference to the university schedule. The work conditions of teachers, in short, are considered to be independent of the work conditions of other educators, especially those of us who work as teacher educators and educational researchers in colleges of education.

The lessons we have learned about collaboration point to the close interrelationships that should exist between colleges of education and

schools, even though they are separate entities. These interrelationships are formed by the distribution of educational mission between two kinds of educational institutions. The most significant progress that we made in improving the professional development of teachers occurred when we shared with them some of our own professional opportunities. Allowing teachers small grants for study or curriculum development; providing teachers time to attend national conferences, to prepare and to present in professional dialogue; and supporting teachers' studies developed and performed for their own purposes are actions that we took that ultimately were significant to the teachers with whom we worked. Each of these activities confronted the way in which institutional missions and job responsibilities have been distributed within our profession. Not only did many of these activities extend the work of teachers as defined in their school district contracts, they conflicted with our own work responsibilities if we were to help teachers address the classroom problems created by their poor professional development.

Our conclusion is that recent reports on the state of education and their accompanying calls for school reform fall far too short of the realities we have faced in schools. Any recommendation for upgrading the educational profession will fall short of the goal of educational excellence if it does not address the redistribution of institutional missions and job responsibilities within the entire educational profession, including those of us in colleges of education. Our fourth lesson, for example, that effective collaboration requires redistribution of institutional mission and job responsibility, is serious and fundamental to the process and to the goal of any educational reform.

Colleges of education not only have resources that can be used as part of the solution to the staff development problems of schools, they are involved ultimately in creating those problems. No critical large-scale study has alluded to this fact. The National Commission, the Carnegie report, and the Goodlad study disappointed us to the extent that they remove colleges of education from their critical focus and reform-minded recommendations for schools. They have missed what we have found from our experiences in collaboration. Colleges of education must be reformed along with schools if the educational conditions of teaching are to be improved fundamentally. Our respective colleges of education can be expected to enrich the education of teachers, to streamline the flow of services, resources, and cooperation with schools. Some of the problems we confronted were far more basic. If we are going to improve the work of teaching and the conditions in which classroom teachers and their students perform, we will have to share some of the more attractive features of our educational work with them.

We four are realists. We do not expect this report to gain significant public attention; but we do expect our colleagues in colleges of education who consider themselves to be part of the solution also to realize that they are a fundamental part of the professional development of schools. Until more critical attention and accompanying professional energies are placed on restructuring our colleges of education to support and to help redefine the work of teaching, the education of our young will not be improved.

This report describes lessons that we believe might provide a design for the beginning of that redefinition. Colleges of education today are being challenged to a degree unparalleled in their history.

INTRODUCTION

For almost 10 years, the authors of this report have worked to develop means whereby college of education faculty could respond effectively to specific problems of public schools. Our approach was first to determine from teachers themselves what problems might be ameliorated through staff development, and then to see how university resources could be used to solve these problems.

The effort was thwarted by a series of impediments before the staff development programs could be launched. In removing these impediments, we have gained a better understanding of what teachers need in staff development programs, what colleges of education can provide, and what changes need to be made in both colleges of education and schools to make staff development effective.

This report resulted from a five-year discourse, begun in October 1981, in which our experiences in staff development were recalled, reflected upon, and analyzed, and specific lessons drawn. We used a research process developed by Elliott (n.d.), Kemmis (1980), and others, which they labeled "deliberative action research." This research method is used primarily with teachers and, in our view, is the best approach for drawing upon and analyzing educators' experiences in staff development. The method holds the principal actors in educational phenomena responsible for recalling and analyzing events and circumstances, with the focus and depth of the analysis controlled by an interrogator. The validity of the lessons is tested later in a deliberative style.

Much of the experience that was recalled for this report was gained from our work in the Teacher Corps program in the 1970s. Three of us were project directors, while the fourth was a planning, research, and evaluation consultant with the national program staff. We have worked long enough in schools of education to know that our Teacher Corps experiences were unusually good. We had responsibilities, money, time, and staff that allowed us flexibility and alternatives to what we normally do as college of education faculty.

While the 1980s differ from the 1970s, we nevertheless believe our experience is valuable in solving many of today's most pressing educational problems in the public schools. Current school conditions have worsened, and the value of drawing upon the rich and varied experiences of our work and applying these to present challenges seems increasingly clear.

What are some significant insights gained from our experience and later evaluation? First, we found that while teachers' initial reactions to staff development were negative (they thought they did not need it and that it was superfluous to their real problems), they eventually responded enthusiastically to the opportunities for professional growth that involved their peers--both school personnel and college faculty. We discovered that teachers, working without feedback on their professional performance, were frustrated and lonely in their classrooms. Given opportunities to grow

professionally and to help their peers grow, their overall satisfaction with their jobs rose significantly.

We also found that teachers could not concentrate on professional development as long as their general work conditions kept them isolated in their classrooms, overburdened with administrative paperwork, demoralized by lack of administrative support and classroom discipline problems, and hamstrung by a general malaise within the school that discouraged innovation. Although correcting many of those work conditions lay outside our purview as college of education faculty, we found that an essential part of our role in staff development was to serve as facilitators in bringing together the teachers, administrators, community leaders, and others who could effect the changes. Without this collaboration, our attempts at staff development were futile.

Further, we learned that staff development could not be based on the professor-instructs-the-teacher model often used. Teachers themselves were the best determiners of their problems, and faculty had to work with them as facilitators, counselors, and sounding boards to be of real use.

The key to such programs' success, then, is collaboration. We realized that the most effective actions we took involved teachers, professors, administrators, and community leaders working toward a common goal of professional development and enhancement. It was the peer interaction itself that often gave teachers the greatest opportunities for professional development and job satisfaction.

Collaboration was also the key to ameliorating the work conditions that impeded effective staff development. Only through collaborative efforts of teachers, professors, and administrators could some of these impediments to staff development be removed. On the school level, such impediments included lack of time during the school day for professional development, poor administrator support, and general malaise. At the fulcrum of these collaborative efforts was the college of education faculty facilitator, who also faced the challenge of removing obstacles to this collaboration posed by the institution of higher education.

In this publication, we concentrate on changes that colleges of education need to make, because we work in these institutions and, frankly, that is where many of our problems arose.

The following is a brief synopsis of the five lessons we learned about collaboration between colleges of education and the schools in the effort to provide useful, effective staff development. Later chapters will describe the study from which these lessons were drawn and will focus on each of the five lessons in more detail.

CHAPTER ONE

SYNOPSIS OF THE FIVE LESSONS

> LESSON ONE: If collaboration is to be effective in staff development, the collaboration must be among people and among institutions.

Personal collaboration involves educators working together to make staff development more effective in accomplishing an educational mission. Working together means combining the experience and knowledge of each educator to accomplish a mission.

Institutional collaboration involves educational institutions combining their resources and personnel in order to improve staff development for teachers that, in turn, may improve certain educational experiences for particular children.

Our experiences have taught us that effective collaboration must be personal as well as institutional. Yet, personal and institutional collaboration are so often distinct in practice. In our respective colleges of education, for example, the few collaborative efforts undertaken are usually personal arrangements between a faculty member and school personnel. This seldom results in better educational circumstances for either. Likewise, institutional collaboration that adheres to a formal procedure involving hierarchies of authority is, by itself, too limited.

> LESSON TWO: A new role--that of the venture educator--must be developed to help mediate responses to local education problems.

For both institutional and personal collaboration to occur, one person, with a support system, must assume responsibility for carrying through responses to educational problems in a variety of educational institutions. This person would muster available resources and develop appropriate staff development responses to problems identified in schools or in colleges of education. This "venture educator" would be hired not necessarily to conduct staff development alone but to be responsible for gathering and coordinating the resources and personnel necessary to resolve obstacles to staff development. The primary duties of the venture educator would be

1. to establish collaborative relationships between school districts and communities;
2. to provide information, resources, and/or assistance toward solving education problems;
3. to offer to school districts those services that promote and provide continuing education;

4. to coordinate research and dissemination activities among universities, school districts, and communities; and
5. to deliver direct instructional services when appropriate.

Supporting a venture educator would indicate a university's commitment to working with school districts to solve education problems confronting both the schools and the colleges of education.

While creating a venture educator role is a stopgap approach to the problems facing educational institutions, our experience suggests that significant reform in resolving local education problems can result from the initiation and maintenance of a venture educator function.

LESSON THREE: Institutional barriers to collaborative action between colleges of education and schools must be reduced.

Unless specific institutional procedures are changed, efforts to improve the professional development of educators through collaborative action will be largely wasted. Our efforts to stimulate collaboration have been frustrated primarily by the rules and regulations of our own institutions.

College of education procedures that restrict the possibilities for meaningful and effective collaboration between the schools and the colleges of education include the following:

1. FTE requirements are defined by institutions in terms of the number of full-time students.
2. The requirements for being in a degree-granting program are often irrelevant and construct reform of teachers' educational circumstances.
3. Semester arrangements of courses, starting in the fall and ending in the spring, do not respond to the local needs or the time availability of teachers.
4. Budget restrictions for resources needed for educational collaboration are often unrealistic and based on the requirements of routine university courses.

This list suggests that restricting procedures may appear, in themselves, innocuous. Many of these rules and regulations could be changed without altering the missions and responsibilities of colleges of education.

Other barriers to collaboration may be caused by traditions of policies that are more fundamental to the missions and responsibilities of colleges of education. Examples of this type of restriction include the following:

1. Faculty members in colleges of education are rewarded mainly for work conducted outside of school classrooms.
2. Collaborative activities are usually related to the service missions of colleges of education rather than to pedagogical or research missions.
3. The departmental organization of colleges of education restricts the possible responses to local educational problems.
4. No real possibility exists within the operational policies of our respective college of education faculty to dwell within schools to the extent necessary.
5. Colleges of education typically neglect long-range planning.

In addition to a wide range of barriers found within colleges of education, certain operating procedures of schools and school districts demand

reform in order to ease collaboration between the schools and the colleges of education. Such school district barriers include the following:

1. Categories for spending are determined by the school board and cannot be altered without its approval.
2. Although it is natural and reasonable for collaborative efforts to follow hierarchical chains of command, we found most school administrators unprepared to discuss staff development of teachers.
3. Collaboration to improve staff development of teachers required more flexibility in teacher time and work responsibilities than school operating procedures and teacher contracts allow.

LESSON FOUR: Missions and responsibilities of colleges of education and schools must be redistributed if professional development opportunities for all educators are to improve.

The most critical and ultimately most important step toward improving staff development for teachers is to redefine the educational missions and responsibilities of schools and of teacher training institutions. Developing a new role of venture educator and diminishing restrictive operating procedures in colleges of education and schools will not suffice to improve professional development. Experience has taught us that missions and responsibilities of colleges of education and schools as now drawn simply will not support collaboration. To improve staff development of educators, the missions and responsibilities of colleges of education and schools must be redistributed in the following seven areas:

1. Teaching--who and what is taught
2. Management and leadership--who makes decisions and how are goals determined
3. Inquiry, research, and dialogue--who promotes understanding of teacher and learning, and how
4. Communication of experience, understanding, and scientific lessons
5. Problem solving--how are educational problems confronted and resolved
6. Participation with the public--who involves the public in education and how
7. Curricular design--the form, focus, structure, and sequence of subject matter and educational style experienced by students

If the missions of teaching, inquiry, leadership, and curricular design were shared more by colleges of education and schools, collaboration could have more substance and the staff development of all educators could be improved. Without more sharing in these areas, collaboration among educators in colleges of education and schools will produce relatively small gains.

In addition, we suggest greater emphasis within colleges of education and schools on educational problem solving and communicating with the public. Staff members' responsibilities in these areas must be delineated and supported and their efforts rewarded.

LESSON FIVE: The first four lessons must be applied simultaneously in local strategies to improve staff development for teachers through collaboration.

For serious reform of the professional development of educators through collaboration to occur, we must apply the first four lessons simultaneously. We must focus on both personal and institutional collaboration. We must install a new staff function, the venture educator, with responsibility for initiating, mediating, and administering the resources and procedures necessary to resolve education problems. We must reduce restrictions on collaboration created by current operating procedures of our colleges of education primarily, but also of school districts. We must redistribute and reassign the missions and responsibilities of our schools and of our colleges of education in such a way that professional development becomes a more natural part of all educators' professional lives.

Applying any of these lessons alone will not produce the desired improvements. Our experience verifies that introducing the venture educator role may result in some interesting work, but without other changes, improvement in staff development will remain frustratingly evasive. Changing certain operating procedures within our colleges of education and school districts will not, by itself, encourage educators to collaborate. Similarly, neither reducing institutional barriers to collaboration nor redistributing the responsibilities of colleges of education and schools will, by themselves, be of great value.

Many of those who have fought for collaboration to improve teachers' staff development have grown cynical about the prospects for success. They have met too many barriers. However, through simultaneous application of the lessons described above, we can enrich professional development for educators and, indirectly, improve instruction for their young pupils.

CHAPTER TWO

PROFESSIONAL CONTEXT FOR THIS REPORT

Our experience was gained primarily from directing Teacher Corps projects for several years. As project directors, we worked with schools and schools of education to resolve specific problems through cooperative efforts.

Teachers expected us to support their work and help improve their working conditions. The school district expected us to help resolve problems noted by schools or the district. Our schools of education expected us to draw upon faculty resources to serve experienced school teachers. Teacher Corps expected us to develop staff development programs in specific areas, such as multicultural education and individualized diagnostic instruction. And teachers, the school district, the schools of education, and Teacher Corps agreed that we were to sponsor collaborative staff development activities and to initiate collaborative decision-making procedures to meet their expectations. Sometimes we succeeded in pleasing everybody; most of the time, of course, we did not.

In this chapter, we introduce the range of our experience in facilitating collaboration between colleges of education and schools by referring to the professional contexts of school districts and staff development, colleges of education, and Teacher Corps. We refer to collaboration as we experienced it within our Teacher Corps projects.

Schools and Staff Development

Although school districts are responsible for the continued education of their teachers, most inservice activities and workshops are but brief ripples in the mainstream of a teacher's job. Staff development has gained increased attention in some school districts (as demonstrated by the National Staff Development Council), but the conclusion reached by Moore and Hyde (1978) probably still holds: In a study of administrative responsibilities for staff development, Moore and Hyde found an average of $1,200 per teacher per year earmarked for the continuing education of teachers, but a pittance actually spent for staff development services. The funds exist; the motivation does not.

When working with schools, it is easy to understand why staff development receives scant attention. First, staff development can become a duty added to the already burdensome work of classroom teaching. Second, if an inservice workshop or staff development program is designed to affect classroom practice, it is almost always the tool of an administrative design, not a staff design. Thus, local teacher organizations advocate contract restrictions to limit teachers' involvement in staff development. Third, staff development and inservice education are seen as irrelevant means for

teachers to improve their work conditions. Once we gained teachers' trust, we learned that they experienced great difficulties and frustrations related to work conditions. Using inservice education, staff development, or university professors to improve these work conditions was to them a futile and nearly contradictory enterprise. Staff development was something someone did to them, not something done to enable them to work with more pride and satisfaction.

Thus, although our respective colleges of education were beginning to consider staff development as a potentially lucrative area and school administrators were becoming interested in staff development as an effective strategy for managing program reform, we found teachers resistant to the idea. We referred to the creative work of staff developers such as Feiman (1979), Applegate (1981), Little (1981), Hall (1981), Joyce (1978), and Howey and Gardner (1982), but that did little to mollify the teachers' reasonable resistance.

Colleges of Education

We worked in colleges of education and wanted to see work that we could respect continued there. But operating with Teacher Corps funds placed us outside of our colleges of education. The staff structure of our projects, the management role of a project director, the demands on us as members of a national program, and even the attitudes instilled by the program made us view colleges of education, as well as school cooperation, differently than we did as full-time faculty. Although we had been employed by colleges of education for five to 20 years and were continuing to fulfill many of our routine faculty roles, we began to view the colleges from a removed and, it must be admitted, more critical perspective.

We had to work with the operating procedures of specific schools and school districts as well as within those of our colleges of education. We had to understand the goals and pressures facing school district adminstrators as well as our deans and university chancellors. We had to build teachers' trust and respond to their interests as well as to the interests and concerns of enrolled university students. We had not only to understand the working conditions of teachers and their difficulties in securing professional enrichment, but also to do something to improve their conditions from their point of view.

But we did not feel alone. Many others have been interested in improving the college of education as an educational resource for teachers. B.O. Smith (1980), Tom (1981, 1984), Fenstermacher (1980), and Olson, Freeman, Bowman, and Pieper (1972) are some whose critical perspectives we began to appreciate more in practical detail as we worked both within and outside of our colleges of education.

Teacher Corps

By the time we began to benefit from our experiences, we knew that the Teacher Corps program would end in less than a year. What we could not capture and analyze in that time would remain only as personal memories. As Fox and Kaplan (1981) discovered in their analysis of Teacher Corps' first 15 years, capturing Teacher Corps experience and drawing lessons from that

experience required focused attention on something hitherto lacking. A large scale, $3 million evaluation of the Teacher Corps program was being completed by SRI International (see Beers, 1981; Bush & Bock, 1981; Deslonde, 1980; Stayrook, 1981; Fox, 1981). Our involvement in that study, however, made it frustratingly clear that little project experience would be related by those performing the study, and few practical lessons would be drawn.

Why are we so concerned about capturing and drawing lessons from the Teacher Corps experience? Much of the answer is found in our respect for the purposes of the Teacher Corps program. Around 1975, Teacher Corps became heavily focused on staff development, constructing educational programs for experienced teachers. The Corps' intentions were grand--for example, to improve the educational opportunities of children from low-income communities. Further, the objectives that local projects were expected to achieve were many and ambitious: to develop a multicultural curriculum; to involve the community; to initiate and sponsor elected community councils and formal steering committees composed of teachers, administrators, professors, and community members. Because the yearly funding for local Teacher Corps projects was relatively high (about $250,000, reduced to about $180,000 in 1981), it seemed possible to meet many of these expectations.

We each had a small staff (including a secretary, a community coordinator, and a school coordinator) as well as money and resources to pay for teachers' released time and for part-time faculty involvement. Our time, too, was paid for, from half- to full-time, thus making it possible for us to plan, spend days and weeks in the schools, manage curriculum development activities, and, most of all, understand the nature of the problems that school personnel and college of education personnel raised about their work. Included in the Teacher Corps grant, in fact, was funding for a planning year--a year to develop strategies for resolving specific problems of colleges of education and schools, to understand the individuals and the institutions we were to work with, and to install the community council, steering committee, and other forms of governance for the five-year project.

Collaboration

We had begun our work as mediators between the schools and our colleges of education when writing the proposals for our Teacher Corps grants. Thus, our attention and responsibilities, once the project was funded, were primarily on supporting actions that would resolve specific educational problems in the schools, and in our college of education's responsiveness to schools.

Three provisions of our Teacher Corps grants helped us assuage the fears of reluctant teachers. First, we pointed out, Teacher Corps required us to work closely with schools for five years. Mere rhetoric would not fill the bill; we would have to provide substance, responsiveness, and understanding. Second, Teacher Corps required that we work with entire schools and their staffs. This would not be the more common situation in which individual teachers were graduate students in a college of education or in which individual professors contract to deliver a particular service to the schools. Third, Teacher Corps required that we share governance of the project. For this project, <u>collaboration</u> would mean more than cooperation; it could not be attained by giving design responsibilities to a few experts and then asking for a vote of teacher confidence.

The budgets for the projects' steering committees, policy boards, and community councils, as well as for certain project positions (e.g., community coordinator, school coordinator), reinforced the importance of collaboration. The time we put into meetings, into travelling between institutions, into administering cooperative functions, and into responding to the political maneuvers of joint governance was considerable. Thus, collaboration became an everyday reality in our work. As it turned out, the spirit of collaboration extended to an attitude of involvement and cooperation among project members and participants--professors as well as teachers, administrators, and parents.

Most of all, however, the source of our experience in collaboration was our personal contact with classroom teachers. Whether at the high school or the elementary school level, we had ultimately to understand and respond to the work conditions of teachers as they described them. We could not come in with a ready plan for educating teachers, no matter how well it had been thought out. We could not ask teachers to tell us their needs if we would not also invite their ideas on reordering their work, their school day, and their responsibilities. Thus, our experience, focused as it was on school staff development and the contribution that colleges of education could bring to schools, turned on the extent to which we could understand teachers' work conditions, the influences of these conditions and their work, and the ways in which these conditions could be improved from the teachers' perspectives.

The following describes the process we used to share our experience in facilitating collaboration between schools and the colleges of education, and to draw lessons from those experiences to guide future collaborative efforts.

CHAPTER THREE

OUR STUDY OF COLLABORATION

We began our study of collaboration with the realization that we needed to make our experience in collaboration and our analysis of our experiences credible to our colleagues in educational research and teacher education. Also, we needed to develop a process whereby lessons from our experience could be drawn, articulated, and tested.

Knowing the rich tradition of involving teachers in critical analyses of their work (Corey, 1953; Hawkins, 1966, based on Dewey, 1929; Schaefer, 1967; Schwab 1978), we were confident of teachers' respect for educational experience. In addition, we could rely upon the advice and practices of researchers such as Carini (1979), Elliott (1979, 1982), and Florio and Walsh (1976), among others, who were developing specific procedures for involving teachers in critical analysis of their work. We believed that we could use this research to help us analyze our experience in collaboration.

Experiential inquiry has not been encouraged among those in colleges of education. As we began, we shared a concern about evaluation by teacher educators and educational researchers. Consider, for example, the following:

Item 1. December 1978, Austin, Tex., an NIE-sponsored national conference on future research in teacher education with more than 200 invited participants: At the end of the conference, the 100 participants were asked to raise their hands if any of them identified themselves as teacher educators. No one did.

Item 2. October 1979, University of Wisconsin-Madison, the Deans' Council-sponsored conference on Research on Teacher Education with about 25 invited participants: When asked in session why most of the two days of discussion was on school practices rather than on college of education practices, the cochair (a professor) answered that everybody knew that nothing could be done to change practices in colleges of education.

Item 3. September 1981, 12 deans distribute an NIE-sponsored "study" on teacher education (later presented at the 1982 AERA annual meeting, Tucker, 1981): The statement claimed that teachers should be educated only at colleges of education that engage heavily in educational research. It further claimed that research funds should go primarily to certain colleges of education that educate teachers. No acknowledgment was made that little relationship existed in the deans' respective colleges of education between ongoing research and the education of teachers. Not only was educational research left undefined, but problems in relating educational research to teacher education were not addressed--in simple terms, it was a nonreflective piece of inquiry.

A few teacher educators have reflected upon their experience in curriculum development. Wise (1977) referred to a process used to draw lessons from a major curriculum development project as retrospective analysis. Wise acknowledged that critical reflection on the work was often intrepreted as extraneous to the task at hand, yet the process was essential, and proved important to the curricular materials that were constructed.

Another major curriculum project from which we drew inspiration is the Humanities Curriculum Project, headed by the late Lawrence Stenhouse of Norwich, England (Stenhouse, 1980). This project dealt directly with the relationship between professional curriculum developers and school educators. Publications from this project (e.g., Stenhouse, 1980; Elliott & MacDonald, 1975; MacDonald & Walker, 1974) addressed and redefined a documentation, analysis, and redirection of action. Experience, not experiment, served as the basis for their analyses. The purposes of the project, improving action and enriching understanding, were seen as intertwined. Historical documentation and explanation, case studies and naturalistic methods of gaining evidence were developed as well as ways to encourage interactive analysis from multiple perspectives. Critical attention was given not only to the work of school personnel, but also to the work of governmental and college of education faculty involved with the curriculum development projects.

Finally, we learned from the documentation and analysis of the process used to develop teacher education programs at Michigan State University (e.g., Melnick & Wheeler, 1983). The researchers used documentation methods and individual critical analyses as strategies to understand their colleagues' experiences and help in redesigning teacher education programs.

In summary, we intended to study our experiences in facilitating collaboration between colleges of education and schools to improve professional development opportunities for teachers. We acknowledged the role of Teacher Corps funds and requirements in initiating these experiences, but we wanted to concentrate on conditions in our colleges of education and school districts. Teachers' experience with action research and reflective analysis gave us the necessary support for this enterprise. The following describes the particular method by which we chose to study the experience we gained, the problems we encountered, and the success and failures we produced.

The Study Method

The method chosen for this inquiry was deliberative action research, sometimes referred to as reflective or practical action research (see Elliott, 1982; Grundy & Kemmis, 1981; Reid, 1981; Elliott & Fox, 1982). Deliberative action research is: (a) focused on action through participants' reflections, (b) performed in an interactive group context, (c) directed by an outside critical questioner and discussion leader, (d) dependent upon participants' analyses for reliability and tests for accuracy, and (e) aimed at the reconstruction of intentional actions in similar situations to those being recalled and analyzed.

Elliott (1982) described deliberative action research as follows:

> First, (action research) is concerned with developing strategies for realizing educational values which cannot be clearly defined in advance, and independently of, the chosen means. Secondly, it is a process in which practitioners accept responsibility for reflection,

and do not simply depend on the analyses of external investigators. The outside researcher's role is to stimulate reflection by practitioners, and the former's "accounts" or "hypotheses" are only validated in dialogue with the latter. Thirdly, and as a consequence of the above points, action research always proceeds from the perspectives of the practitioner's ends-in-view. And finally, it is a necessary condition of the professional development of teachers. (p. 3)

In our case, Elliott's "developing strategies for realizing educational values" meant drawing lessons about institutional and professional collaboration. As he suggested, the distinction between collaboration, improving teachers' professional development, and the work conditions of teachers is fuzzy. Each is, at different times, both means and ends. For our study, the three project directors, Anglin, Fromberg, and Grady, accepted responsibility for reflection on their own actions; Fox, the outside researcher, stimulated reflection through questioning and referring to previous statements and accounts. Accounts, reflections, hypotheses, and lessons learned from the project directors' experiences were validated through their dialogue rather than by independent corroborations. We found, as Elliott claimed, that deliberative action research was a necessary condition for our professional development.

We must emphasize, however, that our deliberations, our reflections on experience, our articulated images of our work, values, actions, and the consequences of these actions were neither natural nor routine. As Elliott and others have pointed out, little of our experience, to say nothing of the lessons reported here, would have occurred to us without the imposition of a structured process of inquiry. Ten significant features of our inquiry process were as follows:

1. Interrogation, probing, description, and analysis were performed in small groups, making it possible for the project directors as well as the interrogator to ask for more clarity and explanation, question individual judgments, and stimulate recall and analyses.
2. Considerable time was made available for each of four interview sessions, with a minimum of about a full eight-hour day, and a maximum of about 20 hours for a two-and-a-half-day session. Performing the interview at sites away from work also freed us from interruptions.
3. The goals of the investigation were made clear and repeated when necessary in order that participants understand the intent of the questions.
4. The three project directors had some common experiences, although their contexts and day-to-day actions were basically dissimilar.
5. The four persons involved respected one another, heard each other out, and were comfortable enough to communicate on personal as well as professional levels.
6. Agendas and outlines for the discussions were distributed before each meeting to stimulate the project directors' recall.
7. Themes were merged as the dialogues progressed; these themes were questioned and reanalyzed as new experiences and lessons were raised.
8. A tape recorder and transcriptions of the dialogues were crucial to the eventual synthesis of lessons learned.
9. The making of case records from the transcripts, the periodic sharing

of drafts, the subsequent reanalysis of descriptions, meanings, and interpretations in later meetings were essential to the critical process of reflective inquiry.

10. The presence of an interrogator--an outsider who pressed the project directors for clarity in the descriptions of actions and contexts as well as the contextual meaning of lessons drawn, judgments made, and recommendations given--was also essential to the process.

The Four Meetings

The following describes the meetings held to perform this deliberative action research and the topics around which the reflective dialogue turned.

The first meeting, held in October 1981 in New York, was both a planning meeting and a pilot test of the deliberative process. During this full-day meeting, the purpose of the study was affirmed, its focus determined, the process tried, responsibilities distributed, and a schedule drawn. Although we had agreed that the purpose of the study was to relate, analyze, and draw upon our experiences, we decided at this meeting that the focus would be on our experiences specifically in stimulating and maintaining cooperation between colleges of education and schools. Further, we agreed to focus on our experiences in trying to address the educational problems of colleges of education and schools, rather than, for example, our experiences in including teachers in such college of education activities as research. We decided that we had more experience in the former than the latter.

During this October planning meeting we also decided that a group interview procedure would be the most efficient, stimulating, and reliable way to articulate and analyze our experiences in collaboration. The initial idea was to use a multiple case study approach with separate site visits and analyses being performed by Tom Fox as the principal investigator. As a few general questions about our experiences were discussed, however, it occurred to us that our interactive dialogue was proving to be particularly valuable in stimulating our recall of events and circumstances. Thus, we decided to use a deliberative action research approach similar to Elliott's (1981).

We arranged a time for the first formal group dialogue and set dates for subsequent meetings. Roles were assigned, with Fox as interviewer, discussion leader, and primary author of the results of these conferences, and Leo Anglin, Doris Fromberg, and Michael Grady as interviewees. We would analyze our experiences, judge the consequences of our actions, and draw lessons from our experiences. Periodic reviews of drafts of the project were shared with colleagues. All discussions were taped and transcribed, except for the first meeting, which Fox recorded. Neutral sites were suggested for the interviews to keep interruptions at a minimum.

The second meeting was held in November 1981 in New Orleans. Critical incidents and events in developing cooperation between colleges of education and schools were described. These included specific instances in which colleges of education provided inservice teacher education to schools. The detail of these descriptions included the intentions, background, actions taken, forces at play, surprises, consequences, and the current standing of these events within the colleges of education and schools involved. Some examples of individual college of education faculty involvement (or lack of involvement) with the schools were described in detail, along with a few examples of individual teachers' involvement.

By the end of the second day after 10 hours of description, only half of the outline had been covered, and a follow-up meeting was set for two weeks later to complete the original outline. A full 10-hour day of discussion was planned, making the total time for this part of the outline (describing our experiences) to be closer to 20 hours, rather than the anticipated 12.

The third meeting was held in early December in Chicago. The dialogue progressed more systematically and efficiently in this meeting than in the previous one. After more talk of individual teachers' involvement in identifying problems that may be resolved by cooperating with education faculty, discussion centered on specific problems experienced in trying to initiate and sustain collaboration. These problems included difficulties in attitude, professional role and status, university and school operating procedures, school and school-district policies, and related conditions.

The fourth meeting occurred a month later, in January, in Fort Lauderdale, Fla. This meeting focused on the lessons and implications drawn from the experiences related in the prior meetings. The first day of discussion focused on lessons learned about collaboration between colleges of education and schools in general and more specifically about the use of collaboration and staff development to improve the work conditions of teachers. The second day of discussion and analysis focused on the implications of these experiences for colleges of education. The third day focused on how colleges of education could apply these lessons and implications.

In summary, our deliberative action research was comprised of 40 hours of reflective accounts and analyses of intentions, circumstances, and consequences of collaboration. The time that elapsed from the daylong planning meeting to the final two and a half days of drawing lessons and implications was a little more than three months. Seven hundred pages of transcripts resulted from the three meetings. These transcripts were reduced to about 250 pages of case records (for stored edited transcripts for public analysis upon request, see Stenhouse, 1979). The case records included selected personal profiles, vignettes of collaborative events, and condensations of some dialogue into script form.

All transcripts and case records were distributed to the four investigators. A draft of an essay on the lessons learned was written by Fox. The essay, its extended outline of major points, and an outline of a final study report were critiqued and redesigned by the four investigators in March 1982. Fromberg wrote and shared drafts of two essays on the range of strategies that could be used to redesign a college of education to collaborate better with schools.

In May 1982, the new draft of the study was shared with Teacher Corps personnel from other projects during their last national meeting. A synopsis of the report was shared, including samples of the individual profiles, event vignettes, the lessons, and the recommendations for actions. The accuracy of the study was praised by other Teacher Corps project directors, and ways were discussed on how to make the report useful. A final draft of the study was then completed and this report subsequently written.

Thus, this study included months of analyzing and redrafting the 700 pages of transcript to the five lessons presented in this report. The following section includes examples of three of the case records--a part of a profile, a vignette, and the dialogue engaged in during the meetings.

CHAPTER FOUR

SAMPLES OF PROFILES, VIGNETTES, AND DIALOGUE
FROM OUR DELIBERATIVE STUDY

Anglin's Profile of a High School Teacher (Meeting Two)

Roberta came from New York to work for Goodyear Aerospace Research Center and became the first woman to be at zero gravity in a simulator. With the aerospace cutback, she found herself laid off and turned to teaching high school biology and science. Roberta has taught for 10 years and is exceptionally good. She teaches in a large high school, that is isolated from current developments and serves as a kind of dumping ground for malcontents who have been transferred from other schools. (Our Teacher Corps project was selected to work with that school to help "patch it up.") The idea of Teacher Corps was initially met with extremely negative faculty responses, and one of the most negative members was Roberta. However, she came to the meetings because of her curiosity.

A vocal critic, both in group meetings and in individual conferences with her school coordinator (a Teacher Corps project person), Roberta continually voiced her disbelief that results would--or could--take place. She challenged me personally as project director with her skepticism, and also attacked my initial presentation to the faculty and to subcommittees. She was particularly critical of mixing elementary teachers with secondary teachers and considered that the lack of common interests made it a waste of time. Because she was so vocal, we included her in our planning committee, on which we tried to include a variety of viewpoints--several negative, several positive, and an uncommitted majority. (We believed that if we got an idea/proposal through the committee, it had greater chances for success. We also found that those who were so critical at the onset were usually the ones who presented the proposals to the full staff most successfully.)

Roberta began working on the planning committee, credit courses, and inservice activities, and participating in one of the committees across buildings; she became, at times, the school representative at university meetings of educational researchers, and attended other university meetings. Quite early in the project, she criticized what we were doing (or more accurately, what we were not doing). She said, "I thought you were going to support teachers, and all you're doing is just planning and talking. I don't see anything good in this for teachers at all." As project director, I was upset because there was validity in what she said. I decided that we could help the individual teacher with mini-grants. Teachers would submit proposals (within the guidelines of the Teacher Corps grant) for no more than $50 to bring in people, supplies, materials (and automatically a Teacher Corps staff person). Roberta wanted to do a rather sophisticated research project with her biology class. In this project they were to scrape some cells and then

grow the scrapings. The chemicals for this project cost about $45, and they did not have the money.

Roberta requested the money as a mini-grant. She started talking and working with it, and got the class started while one of the Teacher Corps staff was visiting the classroom. Through a faculty member, Roberta met a hospital doctor doing similar studies who advised her on how to conduct the research. The first time the students did the study, it failed! She called the doctor and gave him the results, and he suggested that she bring the class to the hospital so they could talk about some of the things they were doing. The study was elaborate, it failed, and now she was taking her class to the hospital. The students planned to report what they had done to see if they could determine what had gone wrong. They were excited about meeting an eminent doctor and researcher; they were surprised that this doctor was black. In many phone conversations, it never had occurred to anyone that the doctor might belong to a minority race. Immediately, we knew the $45 was well spent to counter such misconceptions.

The students visited with the doctor and staff for an entire day at the hospital. They discovered what they did wrong and why the procedures did not work. They wanted to try again, but they did not have the chemicals, so the doctor gave them $50 worth of chemicals. They began the project anew and even worked on it after school. Because they were not sure what they were doing, they panicked when touchy steps developed in the process after the cultures were grown. They called the hospital and spent almost two hours on the phone going through the procedure with the doctor or one of his staff members, talking through the steps, and pulling it together.

This time the project was a great success. The students were excited--even ecstatic--and so were the people at the hospital. It was very rewarding for them. Roberta was recognized in the hospital. When the doctor got a grant that needed community representation, he asked her to serve on the advisory council. It was inspiring for her, for the students, and for all of us. It was rewarding to see that kind of result from a mini-grant, an effort to get some kind of special project going for this class, an involvement. I think that involvement was what Roberta was seeking, as it is easy to build negative feelings without positive feedback from colleagues.

Soon after the project, Roberta began working with elementary teachers. She arranged for elementary school pupils to tour her high school science fair, she taught demonstration lessons in the elementary schools, and had her students act as guides, orienting the children to the high school, especially its science classes. When Roberta conducted elementary school demonstrations, she brought two classes (about 30) of her high school students who assisted with follow-up activities with the pupils (such as working with microscopes, etc.). Roberta also became one of our main contacts with other schools, where she had much more credibility than we university people.

Over time Roberta turned from the biggest critic to the strongest advocate of the Teacher Corps program; but she still had the same values, goals, and concerns she had before. She was looking for a support system. She was a good teacher looking for ways to get better and to receive some significant recognition. Teacher Corps provided some of this: She wanted her work to be better, she wanted her work conditions to be better, she wanted to do something, and Teacher Corps made it possible.

The main thing Roberta learned was how to work with other people. Her background as a scientist and as a teacher was that of working in isolation. Teacher Corps offered her the opportunity to work with the community, the

university, other colleagues, and other schools. It provided her with a support system and recognition that went beyond her classroom. For all of these, she received no extra pay, only the small mini-grant, and, occasionally, Teacher Corps paid for a substitute teacher for her.

Although this minimal support is now uncertain, depending on how the university will use its budget, Roberta remains active. For example, she is working on an inservice program with a university science education professor for biology, chemistry, and physics teachers. She is not rehashing content and teaching style, but is bringing in speakers such as a doctor from Children's Hospital to talk about children and a court judge to discuss the right-to-life (and death), the creation-evolution debate, and the impact of these on teachers. These courses are for teachers who do not need the credit, but who want to be brought up to date. Roberta's impact on the university will be phenomenal, if, as we learn from her, we build programs for teachers like her.

Vignette and Dialogue on Personal Communication (Meeting Three)

In the following dialogue, Doris Fromberg begins with a description of her meeting with a teacher in a school hallway. She refers to Eddie, a child in the teacher's class, which she had observed briefly.

DORIS: I just indicated what Eddie had been doing. And I said to John, the teacher, "Eddie seems to be pretty much a problem, as you're saying." "Oh yes," John responded, and he began telling me his frustrations. This was the first time I'd been in his class for any length of time with no kids, and all the seats were lined up facing the chalkboard. He complained about the problem of trying to get everybody's attention all at once. I reiterated support for him in his frustration, and suggested once in a while he might consider, without any guilt feelings, that it is okay to have the kids doing independent activities instead of trying to reach the whole class, and for him to do a lot of circulating. "You have a chance to do a lot of fleeting teaching. Since you have a fixed 5th-6th grade anyway, you could get some fleeting teaching, give a lot of positive attention to the four kids who are always--literally--banging on the table for attention," I said. He had described this vivid scene. "You don't have to feel guilty--that's perfectly legitimate. When you get rid of that sense of frustration, even for a few minutes, you've given yourself some relief. That's okay." I hoped eventually that we'd get him to decentralize the instruction. As I left him, I did something that was mildly dangerous, but it felt right to me at the moment. I gave him a hug. (Laughter) I do it with the principal all the time, but she's 67 years old. No, I don't think it's dangerous from the point of view of his not being able to deal with it. I think teachers need a lot of figurative hugs, and principals do, too, as an emotional message. Ruth Ann, the project coordinator, came in to visit him later as part of her regular schedule. She told me, "I don't know what you did with John; he was a different person." She described him circulating. I don't know how far this will go. I expect I now have an invitation to his classroom, and I'm not sure how I'll use it. I'll let you know

later. This isn't meant to be a success story here, but it's an entry point, a beginning. I think the hug was important, probably more important than the advice.

LEO: What we're always talking about, I think, is recognition, putting together support systems--that may be why collaboration really is not, "This is how you do it." Collaboration is more of a vehicle.

TOM: Except those words, recognition and development of support systems are really impersonal terms.

LEO: Impersonal?

TOM: Well, they can be interpreted that way, very much. Where hugs can't be.

MIKE: I don't see them as impersonal. I'd say just the opposite. What do you mean, they're impersonal?

TOM: I hear talk about development, support systems in a way that....

MIKE: I see hugs as part of a support system....

LEO: I think Mike and I were talking about hugs, but it's not, that would not be our style.

DORIS: You're missing a lot of fun. (Laughter)

LEO: But in other ways.

TOM: What would support systems mean, or recognition, that's different from hugs?

LEO: I think a hug would be...for me with Roberta, it would be to invite her out of the building for a day.

DORIS: ...she gets a lot of recognition/satisfaction, appreciation of her work, caring about her as an individual. It doesn't come quite that way, though.

LEO: But it's the saying, "Hey, you've got something to offer. You're a good person."

DORIS: Okay.

LEO: And "You're a good teacher. I value you." I think that's another way of giving a hug. That's what Doris was saying to John: "You're a good person--I value you. I'd like to help if I can."

TOM: Would it be as valuable, let's say, if you gave Roberta a free bus pass so she could go to the university? Would that be as good? Or would it be, I'm trying to think of....

MIKE: Free tuition? I don't get....

TOM: Okay, let's say free tuition.

DORIS: You're playing out the parent thing--I'll give you all the money you want, but don't ask me to give you my time.

TOM: So let's say, the transition between school and university is easier to make. I'm asking whether that is what you mean by a support system or wether it's more personal--recognition, more conversation--more indications of one's worth or respect for one's work....

LEO: Oh, I think it's much more personal than a bus pass.

DORIS: Mike might define it in Lynn. She's effective with teachers because she comes on low-key. What's that low-key doing? That low-key is making personal contact, if somebody's mother is sick, sending a one liner, or just asking how are things going? It's all those little personal....

MIKE: Sensitive, caring....

DORIS: It's those little personal things that take place between human beings that make the entry...not just because you're brilliant, and have marvelous content to offer.

TOM: Is there anybody who talks about collaboration in personal terms?

MIKE: I like this conversation. It's enlightening me about the kind of work I've been doing for seven years. (Laughter)

LEO: Let me give you another example of what I think of....

DORIS: You mean you've been hugging people....

MIKE: Well, kind of. When collaboration is mentioned, this is not the kind of thing that initially comes to my mind....

TOM: It's just a term?

DORIS: Collaboration refers to a formal structure that we think of when we write our technical reports. But that formal structure, for me, is always modulated by getting to the individuals beforehand, getting their input. For example, I'm not going to risk going to a public meeting without knowing what the individuals are into politically--that would be suicidal. I do it sometimes because I have no choice. But given a choice, I will always go one-on-one with people.

LEO: I think that's probably what we're talking about. It is how to personalize teaching, and another example of a hug....

TOM: No, no, it's how to personalize the interaction between teachers and the university.

Dialogue on Institutional Collaboration (Meeting Four)

In this dialogue we discuss the organizational structures of colleges of education and schools and how their respective missions hinder staff development.

LEO: We have two systems: one, the public schools and two, the university. Just by their organizational structures and design as closed systems, we have a real restriction on what can be done in staff development.

TOM: Is that getting worse?

DORIS: It's worse.

LEO: Consequently, what we're trying to do is work with two organizational structures. This does not make it easy for collaboration to take place. I think that's why you have the individualistic character that may facilitate it, which might be a Teacher Corps director, or a Teacher Corps project. Or something like that.

TOM: What do you mean by organizational structure? Do you mean the staff, how the staff is organized according to some hierarchy, that there's no unifying position of someone who's on both staffs? If there is nobody to link them, then there's the school district with its line and staff positions, its organizational chart; and the university with its organizational chart. There's no interconnection?

LEO: There is no connection. Teacher Corps, I think, served as a temporary system. And....

MIKE: That's a good way of looking at it.

DORIS: It's catalytic.

LEO: But there hasn't been a real structure there. Neither organization has seen it as that important.

TOM: I've never seen an organizational chart of a university.

MIKE: They exist....

TOM: I know they exist, but do they look any different from a school district's?

DORIS: No.

LEO: It's line and staff.

DORIS: Who reports to whom is how it's designed.

TOM: But where are the professors on that? The faculty? To what extent

are they independent of....

MIKE: You're assuming they're on there.

TOM: That's what I was wondering.

DORIS: They filter into the dean's line.

TOM: Some universities have a different line from the dean, don't they?

MIKE: Well, you would have president, vice president, dean, chairman, faculty.

TOM: All in line positions?

LEO: Those would be the line positions. Then you'd have staff positions, such as director of research, director of graduate studies, assistant to...which would mean that the faculty would not report to that person.

TOM: So when you say the two organizations are built independently--my guess is that one way is how the line and staff positions are drawn, and another way how the missions are defined, or the....

DORIS: That's what I keep coming back to: the mission. The major restriction in each case is the mission. The union and the teachers involved with the union perceive that anything to do with administration is a matter of negotiation and trade-off. I've heard them say it just this weekend. Loud and clear--in those words. It's all trade-offs.

TOM: What's all trade-offs?

DORIS: Any time you collaborate with administration, you're talking about trade-offs. That's exactly the way they have structured it. A conference we had this weekend with the state education department had a section on collaboration, a section on needs assessment, a section on inservice delivery, and a section on evaluation. In dealing with collaboration, that is exactly the way the union people stated it.

TOM: I think I know what they meant by <u>needs assessment</u> and <u>evaluation</u>, but what did <u>collaboration</u> mean?

DORIS: <u>Collaboration</u> was defined differently by different people. The party line of the conference was to obtain a broader view of collaboration as a combination of role groups--including administrators, universities, school people--a role for everybody. Now, the teachers didn't want to hear anything, except what they wanted.

TOM: So, collaboration to them was a matter of conflict of interest?

DORIS: That's how they interpreted it.

TOM: And getting along the line of one's interest as far as is politically possible. Collaboration wasn't a way of addressing particular common problems....

DORIS: No, not at all. The role they see for university people--when they're willing to see one--is to help make their jobs easier. Again, it's a consumerist approach. And consumerism becomes a big part of the acceptance of a university person. At the proposal-writing stage, when I used to start talking Teacher Corps, I'd say I'm here for your "shopping list." Give me your whole shopping list, and then let's talk about what's possible within the Teacher Corps guidelines.

LEO: One of the things I think is probably difficult, in terms of getting the school organization and the university organization together--and the community complicates it even more--is that the missions and goals of the respective programs are so different. There's real confusion when people first start talking about what collaboration is--the school's mission is pupils, and generally that is measured by standardized achievement tests. The university's mission is more in terms of adult education--teachers, administrators, and the act of working with them. Although that's the university's primary mission, that's not necessarily viewed as a need by the people in the field. If you're a teacher in a classroom, you don't see that you necessarily need to be involved. And consequently, what collaboration means to school people is a professor from a university coming to teach a class, team-teaching it, being there, working at the pupil level. Until you clarify where you're going to work together, you've got some real problems, because the two shopping lists may not be the same. Or they may have a very small intersection.

TOM: It's back to the theme that neither the schools nor the colleges of education see school staff development as being essential to carry off either of their missions.

LEO: I think they're seeing it as being more essential, but neither sees school staff development as the major concern.

CHAPTER FIVE

LESSON ONE
COLLABORATION MUST BE BOTH PERSONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL

> LESSON ONE: If collaborative actions are to be effective in improving the professional development of teachers, the collaborating must be among individuals and among institutions.

We begin by distinguishing two types of cooperative actions in education: personal collaborative actions and institutional collaborative actions.

> Personal collaborative actions. Personal collaborative actions are educators working together to make the professional development of one (or both) more appropriate and effective for accomplishing an educational mission. By "working together," we mean using the understanding, experience and knowledge of each educator to accomplish a task.

> Institutional collaborative actions. Institutional actions are educational institutions combining their resources and personnel to improve staff development that may improve certain educational experiences of particular children.

As the reader notices, we describe collaborative actions by the manner in which educators work together in addition to their institutional affiliation and occasional proximity (being in the same room, for example, does not make a collaborative actedion). We also have restricted our descriptions of collaborative activities to actions taken to improve particular work conditions and professional development of teachers and other educators. This keeps the focus on the experiences raised in this study--the continuing education of teachers.

Our experiences have taught us that effective collaboration must combine personal and institutional collaborative actions at the same time. As much as this lesson may represent common sense, we emphasize the combination because the two are so often distinct in practice. In our respective colleges of education, for example, the few collaborative actions undertaken are usually personal arrangements between a faculty member and school personnel. Such arrangements seldom result in better staff development.

We have observed too many instances where a faculty member has been hired to address a particular school problem, and has responded simply as a professor talking to students. In one of our earlier experiences, we hired a professor to address the challenge of mainstreaming students in the classroom. In a semester's time, this expert taught the teachers all he knew, but that was not enough. Our assumption had been that knowledge would solve the

problem, but it became more apparent that mainstreaming had to be addressed through institutional as well as personal means. An individual alone, especially without exchanges of resources between the two institutions, could not address the complex pedagogical and institutional demands of mainstreaming handicapped students into traditional classrooms.

To develop conditions that support new work routines generally demands that collaboration be both institutional and personal. When, in the example above, we reached agreement between the school and the college of education (rather than between the school and the professor), the mainstreaming problem was resolved as an institutional issue. It was a matter not only of "working together," but also of requiring formal institutional cooperation focusing on the work conditions of the teachers who were trying for the first time to mainstream children in their classes.

Likewise, institutional collaborative actions (such as following a formal procedure or including the hierarchical lines of authority within our respective institutions) are not enough without personal collaborative actions. Collaborative actions directed toward improving the professional development of teachers and other educators must include specific institutional arrangements between the respective institutions. To describe these activities only in terms of institutionally designated processes, however, is to oversimplify the nature of collaborative activities.

In the example of Roberta, the biology teacher, it is clear that personal interaction was necessary. If our approach had been limited to combining the resources of the college of education with her high school to improve the work conditions of that school, she would not have become so involved. It took people working together to create the response of "mini-grants." Only when this cooperation took place on a personal dimension were Roberta (her teaching and her sense of professionalism) and her students affected. The following examples illustrate actions that we suggest are <u>not</u> collaborative, because they do not include both institutional and personal dimensions.

- A professor working with a teacher in a tutorial fashion--the informed informing the uninformed: These activities may be useful at times (with occasional transference of who is and is not "the informed"), but they are <u>not</u> collaborative activities. The understanding, experience, and knowledge of one party has been determined to be deficient and not a contribution to the task at hand.

- A school district and a college of education deciding how the responsibilities of teaching, teacher education, and research are to be split up--"you teach the kids, we'll teach the teachers; you teach, we'll research; you read, we'll write": Again, these activities may be important in some circumstances, but they are <u>not</u> collaborative activities. The respective resources and personnel are not being combined to improve existing work conditions of teachers.

- A blue-ribbon panel of individuals from colleges of education, schools, and other organizations agreeing to a proposed educational practice, text, or curriculum change: Although this formal procedure may be critial at times, it is neither active nor specifically focused on certain populations of children or educators. This is a process of certification and agreement, not a process of creative work and problem solving.

- A contract signed by a college of education to deliver a particular course or a set of workshops over a certain length of time (say, a year). This is not a creative act taken to address specific circumstances. It may be an important act, taken for mutual survival, but it is not a form of collaborative actions taken to improve the educational work conditions of school staff. Since it has no specific referential student population nor educational circumstance that is to be altered, improved or built upon, it (at best) could be considered a symbolic gesture toward educating teachers.

Although the above four examples are about noncollaborative actions, many other experiences demonstrate institutional and personal collaborative actions in addition to those that we have experienced. Examples include the following.

- Elliott and Adelman's (1976) work with teachers in developing hypotheses about teaching. Also Elliott's (1981) continued work with teachers' involvement in inservice program evaluation, reflective analysis of their work, and self-evaluation. The teacher-initiated Network for Action Research is included in these collaborative actions among teachers, other school personnel, and educational researchers who intend to improve the educational work conditions of teachers.

- Carini's (1979) approach to the analysis of children's creative work. Teachers, students, and others interested in understanding the individual student's development of style and organization of meaning are all encouraged by Carini's method to participate together in a group process to analyze the creative work constructed by a single child over time. The institutional consequences for supporting this type of analytic activity have also been pursued by Carini.

- D. Smith's (1982) approach to ethnography in the classroom and school where the teacher and student become descriptive analysts of their own actions. The intent is to improve the educational understandings of those engaged in educational activities. To apply this approach would take both institutional and personal collaboration.

- Michigan State University's School of Education and Institute for Research on Teaching are attempting to reform its teacher education programs and include more "practitioner involvement" in its research activities. These are efforts to combine the various resources of different educational institutions to arrive at better educational circumstances of educators. The lack of real success to date suggests how difficult collaborative activities are, even when they are supported by leaders within their respective institutions.

- Hundreds of teacher centers have emphasized, in general, active teacher involvement in improving their work conditions, and many of these centers have institutional support and are maintained by their school districts. Yet, many centers are minimally involved with colleges of education. When there is interaction, it tends to be workshops, courses, or research. This appears to be changing, and we are interested to see if the interaction will be characterized by both

personal and institutional collaboration.

- During its 15-year esistence, more than 120 Teacher Corps projects throughout the country experienced formal collaborative arrangements between schools, colleges of education, and communities. Some also dealt closely with state departments of education. Of course, governance boards and steering committees alone do not suggest project-sponsored collaborative activities as we have defined them. In discussions with other project directors, however, we understand that a wealth of experience and performance in stimulating, sponsoring, and implementing collaborative activities exists for the improvement of the educational work conditions of teachers. Thus, our experiences are representative of a large number of persons in colleges of education and schools whose work has been sponsored by the Teacher Corps program (Deslonde, 1980).

- In addition to Michigan State University, other colleges of education intend to include more collaborative actions with schools and school persons. The University of California at Berkeley and Stanford University are two examples of institutions that currently are redefining and reanalyzing the missions, responsibilities, and professional arrangements of their respective colleges of education. We are waiting to see to what degree their reconstructed arrangements will, or will not, support both personal and institutional collaborative activities as we now understand them.

As the examples above illustrate, many actions have been taken to improve the professional development of teachers that may include both personal and institutional collaborative actions. But we are ruling out much--including formalistic procedures for reaching consensus and didactic teaching by individual experts. Our twin descriptions of collaborative actions also rule out most college courses in education (no matter where they are held) and single workshops (whether they last an hour, a day, a week, or a month).

Our definition does not imply that everything included in collaboration is good. In fact, much of what we have experienced in collaboration is, first, extremely difficult to initiate and maintain, and second, questionable in its ultimate long-term success because of the difficulties that educators and their institutions have in acting collaboratively to address staff development. A problem is that our educational institutions, with their definitions of professional roles in education (e.g., teacher, college professor), do not support collaborative activities and, in reality, effectively resist collaboration with rules, regulations, formal procedures, and expectations.

Today, any collaborative action taken between a college of education and a school is usually a triumph of human energy and creative "street smarts." Most individual educators who have participated in a collaborative activity have engaged in a quixotic act. As respectful of such heroic performances as we are, however, our experience suggests that we are all partially responsible for the challenges we face. In particular, we could alter the work conditions of teachers, which make collaboration both necessary and extremely difficult. If we educators wanted to, we could build educational communities where institutional and personal collaborative actions are natural. To collaborate is mainly a personal triumph over circumstances we create for ourselves.

CHAPTER SIX

LESSON TWO
A VENTURE EDUCATOR ROLE MUST BE ESTABLISHED

> LESSON TWO: A new role and function--the Venture Educator--must be developed for mediating staff development responses to educational problems in schools.

If both institutional and personal collaborative actions are to occur, there must be a person with a support system who can take responsibility for carrying through an effective response to an identified educational problem in a school or in a college of education. This person, who call the venture educator, would muster available resources and develop appropriate educational responses to particular problems identified in schools or in colleges of education.

This lesson acknowledges that colleges of education and schools are separate educational institutions with different missions, roles, responsibilities, backgrounds, and governance procedures. The person in this new position (and a small staff) would act as a focusing agent, the individual who could dwell on the problem within the working and personal contexts of the college and the school. The venture educator would have to (a) understand the work conditions; (b) understand the relationship of these conditions to the staff development problem, perhaps redefining the problem if necessary; (c) know the range of available people and relative effectiveness of supporting resources in both institutions; (d) identify and attract those individuals who could best address the problem and the supporting resources; and (e) deliver the interactive style and process necessary for an effective staff development response.

In many ways, this set of responsibilities is similar to the ones we eventually learned to satisfy in our roles as directors of local Teacher Corps projects. To accomplish certain tasks, we realized that we were required to spend time in the schools to gain a detailed understanding of the personnel and work conditions of both the schools and the colleges of education. From our experience, we recognize the difficulties, complexities, time, patience, and some hard professional decisions about personal friends required by such a role. We also experienced the reward of being a mediator or catalyst, and seeing the work conditions of teachers improved by applying a process that integrates the resources and personnel of both the colleges of education and the schools. What we learned, in short, is the necessity of a catalyst role.

If we were referring to business rather than to education, the suggested title would be venture manager. A venture manager is an outside consultant brought to a business to resolve a particular problem that insiders have found difficult to resolve on their own. The venture manager is not necessarily the problem solver, but is expected to analyze the situation and context of an

organizational problem, to locate the resources and personnel necessary to carry through an effective redesign of the organization, and to stay with the process within the organization until the problem is resolved. In short, the venture manager functions as a problem analyst, resource identifier, and catalyst for change within a system.

For the venture educator, a similar set of responsibilities exists, but in educational settings with educational problems and educational solutions. We may borrow the model from business, but we must adapt it to a person who (a) understands a variety of educational settings (such as elementary schools, high schools, and colleges of education); (b) is informed and aware of a variety of educational actions, strategies, and perspectives; and (c) knows a variety of resources and people who can deliver and participate effectively in particular kinds of educational actions.

Like the venture manager, the venture educator would be contracted to address an identified problem and remain until it is resolved. She or he is hired not to solve the problem alone, but to gather and coordinate the resources necessary to resolve it, making sure that process continues through resolution.

For a venture educator, educational problems are, for example, created by parties acting on wrong or misleading information, or by a lack of understanding about what can be done to improve students' learning. An educational problem often occurs because of certain work conditions of teachers or students. Many of these work conditions, ironically, include the lack of opportunity to engage in educational actions, in self-involving situations. The essential feature of an educational problem is that it requires, among other actions, instructional strategies of one kind or another with those involved in, or responsible for, resolving the problem.

The educational problems that venture educators address are those that require educating educators about ways to change their work, especially the work conditions of students and teachers. In the context of this study, we refer to a venture educator addressing the educational problems of colleges of education and schools. This need not always be the case for a venture educator. Just as venture managers may apply themselves to business problems of educational organizations, so too may venture educators apply themselves to educational problems of service or business organizations.

We acknowledge the entrepreneurial tone to the term venture educator, but we want to make clear that the venture educator is not entirely an entrepreneurial role. We do intend the term to carry aggressive, active connotations as well as imply that the venture educator performs under contract ("for hire," if you will). In addition, the position of venture educator is a risk-taking role, relatively free to act with a degree of independence from college of education or school restrictions, but maintaining a responsibility for resolving a particular work-related problem in an educational institution. The role, however, is neither autonomous nor individualistic; a good mentor or catalyst seldom gains attention. Instead, the venture educator is entrepreneurial in the sense of acting aggressively and autonomously in coordinating people and resources, but is neither individualistic nor aimed toward personal productivity. The venture educator would represent both institutions and could ensure institutional as well as personal cooperation.

Our experience suggests that this role is necessary because of the present difficulties in getting cooperative involvement, long-term planning, and natural interaction between school personnel and college of education

personnel (even among personnel in a single institution). Creating the role of venture educator would be a significant step toward providing both the personal and institutional collaborative actions needed to resolve an educational problem. We suggest the role of a venture educator is essential if colleges of education and schools expect to collaborate toward more effective professional development programs for their respective staff members. If, for example, we had not had the time to dwell within Roberta's school or to understand her and her work situation through her conflict with us, we never would have responded with the idea of a mini-grant. It was our opportunity to work in the school, yet not quite be part of the school, that helped us identify the educational circumstances about Roberta that needed to be addressed and the work conditions that needed to be changed.

We believe there are a number of people who could act as venture educators in developing dynamic educational responses to educational problems. Table 1 proposes a job description in an announcement format, capable of being placed, for example, in the Chronicle of Higher Education.

TABLE 1

Job Description, Venture Educator

The following job description is presented for a new position in the College of Education, entitled Venture Educator. The primary duties of this position include:

1. To establish collaborative relationships with school districts and their communities

2. To provide information, resources and assistance in resolving educational problems confronting school districts

3. To offer services to school districts that promote and provide continuing education (training)

4. To coordinate research and dissemination activities among the university, school districts, and communities

5. To deliver direct instructional services when appropriate

In general, this position will reflect the college's commitment to working with school districts in a collaborative way to resolve educational problems confronting the schools.

We suggest that if this job announcement (or a similarly worded one) were placed in the Chronicle, an interesting and comparatively wide range of experienced educators would apply.

The venture educator's role is a realistic one. There are educators who

can act as mediators, contacts between colleges of education and schools, group-process designers, and persons responsible for seeing a problem through to its resolution. We know many people, and suspect the reader does also, who can understand the work conditions of teachers in specific schools and know how to gather resources to improve their work conditions through professional development. What is necessary now is to create the role and support the function.

Where would this role be situated? We would leave that to local circumstances, but our experience suggests the most realistic location now is in the college of education. We do not claim that it is the most desirable place to create and sustain this new role, but the current roles that have been hewn for administrators within schools and school districts as well as the adversarial relationships developed between them and the teacher organizations suggest to us that it would be extremely difficult to locate an independent yet integrative venture educator role within a school district. We also must acknowledge the antagonism that sometimes prevails between teachers and professors. However, these conflicts usually are neither so overt nor so institutionally based as those between teachers and administrators.

If the venture educator position were included within a college of education, it would have to be independent of the regular faculty for two reasons: to counteract the covert antagonism between teachers and professors referred to earlier, and to have the freedom and independence to select faculty members from the school and the university.

The venture educator function also might be performed through an agency outside of the school, the college of education, or the university. It could, for example, be located in a private organization, in a consortium of school districts and colleges of education, or within a state or federal government agency. The point here is that a venture educator role is absolutely necessary given: (a) the realities that our schools and colleges of education are separate educational institutions; (b) the reality of how educational problems can be resolved through cooperative efforts between schools and colleges of education.

In summary, on the basis of our experiences in our collaborative work, we suggest that the role of venture educator be created to mediate staff development responses to school and college of education problems. First, we find that problems exist in schools and in colleges of education that are related to professional development. The solutions of the problems are beyond the capabilities, resources, or perspectives of those present in either organization. Second, a range of educational perspectives and views is held, often outside of a particular educational institution, that may be used effectively in responding to a professional development problem. Third, an individual can be expected to act as a catalyst for action, as a mediator of interests and resources that need to be mustered for resolving a problem. Fourth, professional development problems change over time as people become better acquainted with the work context and circumstances of the problem; a venture educator would observe and understand these changes.

An experienced manager is necessary--a person responsible for continuing with the learning and response process until the staff development solution is successfully completed and the problem resolved. This differs, we may add, from a consultant's effort to hear a problem, design a solution, and then leave. It is essential for the venture educator to become familiar with the school, its people, routines, and operational characteristics. For a staff

development problem to be understood in terms of the work conditions of those in the school, just "being there" is often important.

Finally, we unequivocally see the creation of a venture educator role as a stopgap response to the realities of our current educational institutions. These realities include the present distinctions made between the work, responsibilities, and duties of college personel. Given these, we consider the creation of a venture educator role to be an essential step toward improving the staff development responses to professional problems. Further, our experience suggests that significant reform in the perspectives and the processes of resolving local school problems can result from the initiation and maintenance of a venture educator function.

These same experiences, however, leave us fundamentally dissatisfied if the sole attention is on the creation of a new mediary role without revision of what makes it necessary. The creation of a venture educator role is an incomplete response: We must have increasing, serious attention and effort toward modifying conditions that make educating educators so difficult. Otherwise, we are left with possible infinite variations of educational mediators, and the complexity of such new roles eventually could create more problems than they resolve.

To conclude this lesson that a new mediation role between colleges of education and schools--the venture educator--is needed, we cannot overemphasize the fact that this can be fulfilled, but that, speaking from experience, it will be a much more difficult job than it should be, partly because of the number of roadblocks within the respective educational institutions.

CHAPTER SEVEN

LESSON THREE
INSTITUTIONAL BARRIERS MUST BE REDUCED

LESSON THREE: Institutional barriers to taking collaborative actions between colleges of education and schools must be reduced.

If particular institutional barriers are not reduced, then efforts to improve the professional development of educators through collaborative actions largely will be wasted. Some of the restrictions we encountered in trying to foster collaboration between colleges of education and schools include barriers in the operating procedures of the colleges of education.

The following summary of restrictions we found is organized into two categories: (1) restrictions in the operating procedures within colleges of education, and (2) barriers caused by college of education missions and responsibilities. This lesson ends with a smaller list of restrictions to collaboration encountered in the operating procedures of school districts.

Restrictions in College of Education Operating Procedures

Although none of the following barriers has made collaboration impossible to achieve, the barriers certainly made our work much harder than it need have been. Further, the sheer number of these restrictions suggests that, without future external support, additional efforts may not be made. Interestingly, many of these restrictions are routine procedures. They are not necessarily tied to the fundamental missions or goals of a college of education; they simply represent how things are done. This may be encouraging, for these rules or regulations can be altered. Their reform would not require professional soul-searching, intense dialogue, or fundamental change in mission. If administrators within the universities (or on the boards that govern the universities) were convinced that education would be served, the restrictiveness of these operational policies could be lessened.

The following 10 items are some of the college of education or university operating procedures that restrict the possibilities for meaningful, effective collaboration between colleges of education and schools.

1. FTE requirements are defined by colleges of education in terms of the number of full-time students. This policy makes it difficult to account for the number of educators affected by collaborative efforts because "student" enrollment is not the total way to document the range and variety of participation. More flexibility is needed to define the numbers and range of individuals who are immediately affected and engaged in collaborative

activities designed to resolve a staff development problem. The involvement of college of education and school personnel in addressing the work conditions of teachers and students through staff development cannot be defined simply in terms of student hours. The involvement is more varied, the impact of the involvement less singularly defined. Although some may respond that FTE accounting requirements are made necessary by the university, we suggest that the university could make special consideration without requiring significant reforms of mission or responsibility of its college of education.

2. Requirements for listing courses in the college of education catalogue lengthens the time and reduces the flexibility for communication. Flexibility and direct communication of available course offerings ("resources" of the college of education) are necessary for those outside of a college of education to know precisely what faculty members have to offer. Sometimes it takes years to get a course offering accepted and listed within college of education catalogues. Course definitions also are too fixed to allow for collaboration between teachers and education faculty. Course syllabi, for example, are not expected to be redesigned through interactive planning. Instead, courses are expected to be designed by the academic experts at the university and followed by their students. In addition, what is written in the course catalogue is often overstated; many course descriptions seriously misinform. Our experience in collaborating with teachers on their professional development shows how wrong this procedure is. Colleges of education must describe their course offerings with more accuracy and with more attention to the possibilities for adaptation by their educator "students" than is the routine in the universities.

3. Requiring students to be in a degree-granting program is often irrelevant to collaborative staff development efforts between teachers and education faculty. For the professional development of teachers, college of education requirements for "students" to be aiming toward a degree and certification reduce the range of courses as well as the variety of purposes. Responding to professional problems to improve the work conditions and professional development of teachers may not require enrollment in a master's, specialist, or doctoral program. Circumstances in the school, community, and classroom, not degree requirements, determine the continuing education of educators aimed at improving their effectiveness and their work conditions. We understand that this requirement is related to university regulations, but we think that special recognition of this problem could be made with no consequent reforms of the major missions of a college of education.

4. The definition of instructional credit hours has been given an unfair treatment in colleges of education. The distinctions made between "course credits" and "workshop credits" currently made within our colleges of education are unnecessary. At this time, the distinctions made for courses and for workshops are not sustained in our experiences of what an effective process must include for teachers and other educators to improve staff development. We are challenging the definition of both courses and workshops in largely noneducational terms of the choice of one definition over the other for the benefit of an "academic" institution. More flexibility is needed in the interpretation of the staff development process for collaborative activities between educators in colleges of education and schools.

5. The definition (and importance) of who is faculty and who is not becomes counterproductive. The roles of participants in most cooperative efforts to improve professional development do not conform to simple faculty-student distinctions. Who is the teacher and who is the student, who holds important information and experiences, and who is responsible for sharing this knowledge change throughout the course. Who gets paid in a university, how they get paid, and what they are paid for often do not conform to the interactive process required for educators to train other educators.

6. Greater flexibility than the semester arrangement of courses is required in joint educational activities between teachers and professors. It is foolish to assume that collaborative activities can be responded to mainly in the summer "down time" of classes. The formalities of course taking are counterproductive to the timing and assessment of collaborative activities. The paperwork necessary for courses, insisted upon by some "paperwork police," denies the spirit of educators working together to improve teachers' professional development. Rather, there is a real need for administrative support and administrative flexibility toward admission requirements into graduate courses. Educators who can benefit from collaborative services should not be denied their involvement on the basis of inappropriate measures of potential contribution and abilities to learn.

7. It is difficult to pay faculty members for their involvement in collaborative actions unless their teaching duties have been replaced by these actions. Although faculty participation in collaboration may be paid by providing services that cost money (e.g., secretarial services, travel expenses, computer time), there should be more flexible rewards. Specific services could have specific salary increments, for example, or time paid. The range of services included in collaborative processes to improve teachers' professional development and work conditions requires flexible remuneration and recognition by the college of education. Although our experience suggests the involvement and contributions can be expected to vary with different faculty members, gradations of support are defined by the quantum reductions of one, two, or three courses. Often, the variation of faculty participation does not conform to this simple three-level salary scale.

8. Resources needed for collaborative activities are often unrealistically limited and based upon routine university course requirements. Photocopying, secretarial services, materials development, educational materials, and books often are required in greater numbers and over longer periods for collaborative activities than for regular university courses. When working with school faculty, the class size can be 50 to 100, rather than the 10 to 30 in a university course. Funding limits for these services may make sense for class-structured college and university courses, but they are not flexible enough to respond to the numbers of students or to the flexibility of their participation when an entire school faculty is involved. More materials are needed for school faculty involvement, especially when some of the school faculty are actively engaged and others merely want to be informed. In addition, support for the long-term, on-site planning and follow-through necessary for effective actions requires different funding patterns for these efforts.

9. Staff development activities are interpreted by universities as

individual faculty consultancies. From a college of education viewpoint, staff development consists of individual faculty members who produce specific educational services for teachers. Our experience suggests this is not how effective cooperation occurs in local educational problem solving or in educating teachers. Instead, staff development must be considered a contractual agreement between a school and a college of education with the resources of both institutions available for addressing problems.

10. The publication expectations for younger faculty, necessary for their tenure and promotion, rewards scholastic rigidity, narrowness of focus, and personal image making through individual productivity which are all counterproductive to effective collaborative actions. Success within the college of education is defined in terms that conflict with success in improving the professional development of teachers. Traditional rewards for individually authored publications, for research directed toward building universal theories, and for developing reputations in specialized areas simply do not reward what is most important in collaborative actions. Essential for faculty collaborating with teachers to improve their professional development and the effectiveness of their and their students' work are the abilities to cooperate, to stimulate others' critical analysis and productivity, to locate specific features of the work conditions of teachers and students that impinge on the resolution of a professional development problem, and to gather the available resources and the support necessary.

We refer specifically to younger faculty members for two reasons. First, if they are not rewarded for collaborative work, they will not gain the experience or be able to apply their energy to these activities. Second, although we do not consider the traditional value of research and personal productivity to be secondary to the value of collaboration, we know from experience that it is much harder for younger faculty to balance these expectations than for more experienced--and tenured--faculty. For a significant proportion of the bright, able, energetic members of colleges of education to engage in collaborative activities with schools, a more flexible reward structure must be constructed, particularly for untenured faculty.

These operating procedures do not cover all the restrictions we encountered in our colleges of education. Instead, they are offered to suggest how the restrictive operating procedures seem. Many of these barriers could be changed with comparative ease without altering the missions and responsibilities of colleges of education.

Barriers by College of Education Missions and Responsibilities

Procedural barriers, which may require fundamental reinterpretations of the missions and responsibilities of colleges of education, may appear relatively innocuous. In addition, we suggest this second list of barriers may require fundamental changes even in the placement of colleges of education within or outside of a university or college. The following are barriers to collaborative actions that we suggest are fundamental restrictions created by the missions and responsibilities given colleges of education.

1. The academic reward system for faculty members is away from the classroom. Graduate school teaching is valued more than undergraduate

teaching; a small class size is the reward for academic excellence; research and an emphasis on a narrow specialty lead to an academic reputation. The lack of status of clinical professors--professors who work directly with the schools in the practicum of student teachers--is another indication that collaborative activities among schools and colleges of education are not respected. The only possibility we see to alter this attitude is to reconstruct the missions and responsibilities of colleges of education. Collaboration, for example, is a viable goal for a college of education, but we do not think it can just be added to the current missions and responsibilities.

2. Collaborative activities are usually related to the service missions of colleges of education rather than to pedagogical or investigative missions. Time, synchronization, and overload problems encountered in collaboration are defined as problems of the individual faculty member coping with the service mission of the college of education rather than as problems in the institutional definitions of research or teaching. Since research and teaching are defined in limited ways by colleges of education, cooperation between the education faculty and school personnel by definition must fall into the service category. From our experience, we suggest that responding to the professional problems and work conditions of teachers is a full-time activity. As the missions of colleges of education are now described and understood, the requirements for effective collaboration with schools cannot be fully appreciated. Institutions must develop in more detail the research and teaching missions of their colleges of education. Although professional debates about the nature of educational inquiry and the variety of pedagogical activities suggest that these terms can have much richer definitions, we simply do not see that happening.

3. The departmental organization of colleges of education restricts the possible responses to educational problems in schools. Cross-departmental cooperation, understanding, and mutually drawn relationships are at least difficult and nearly impossible to maintain to the degree necessary for a college of education to respond effectively to educational problems in the schools. When specialties and expertise are organized according to an academic template created by the arts and sciences, then staff development responses become similarly defined. We found most educational specialists less effective than educational generalists in working with school educators. Yet, the departmental organization supports the educational specialist.

We also have realized that educational administration departments are not helpful regarding potential college of education and school collaboration. Although administration departments generally have the closest connections with schools and the most "students" (who are using this opportunity for hierarchical advancement), they seldom, if ever, design professional responses to educational problems. The most powerful departments in colleges of education focus on resolving educational problems through the exercise of bureaucratic authority. If the missions of colleges of education were redefined in educational terms that emphasize the relationship between the schools and the colleges of education, far different departments would be organized within colleges of education.

4. Colleges of education are designed to play the university game at the expense of responsiveness to local educational problems. The university game

means that the expertise of individual faculty members is to be directed toward remedial work with the "uneducated." It is difficult, however, for such expertise to be applied through interactive dynamics with a problem-solving team composed of educators from different institutions. The lack of collegial interaction and substantive dialogue among individuals of the same college of education suggest how difficult it is for faculty members to work together on joint activities that require a give-and-take of planning as well as an anticipated absence of publishable research. This, again, directly relates to the university ideal of specialists whose professional, collegial relationships are with those from higher education institutions other than their own. Accompanying the lack of experience in (and support of) collegial dialogue is a lack of respect for the nature of such work. The time and energy required for substantive reform of the professional development of teachers through efforts between college of education and school educators is simply not commensurate with the value of such activities as represented by the missions of a college of education.

When Clark and Amiot (1981) argued that colleges of education cannot be expected to share "knowledge production" activities with school personnel, they did so on grounds that it conflicts with the research mission of colleges of education as they understood it. Responding to Emrick and Peterson (1980), they suggested that the college missions of service and teaching can be expanded to include cooperative activities with teachers.

Our experience conflicts with Clark and Amiot's conclusion. We found it too difficult to address professional development problems in schools and the work conditions of teachers with the present research mission of colleges of education. The notions of expertise and knowledge contradict the assumptions needed to work together to address professional problems in schools. Moreover, the time, focus, process, and effort of educational research, as it is usually understood and rewarded, makes it practically impossible to address the work and the work conditions of teachers. A more flexible definition of research is required, including action research, deliberative inquiry, responsive evaluations, democratic evaluations, and other modes of inquiry more sensitive to the professional development features of critical investigations into educational contexts and practices. Colleges of education, in short, must alter the rules of the university game to meet the circumstances of professional development.

5. No real possibility exists within colleges of education for faculty to dwell within schools to the extent necessary. A critical example of the lack of understanding and appreciation by the college of education for the challenges to effective collaboration is the lack of time faculty are allowed to dwell in schools. Collaboration requires in-depth, on-site understanding of specific circumstances in the school. As we learned, this time is essential to understand the nature of the educational problems, as well as to respond with effective personnel, dynamics, and resources. Such times seem irrelevant to the missions as they are now defined in colleges of education.

6. The absence of long-range planning within colleges of education is a serious barrier to drawing reforms to the professional development of teachers. The requirements of planning systematic, effective responses to the professional problems of school personnel cannot be expected to be met when colleges of education seldom anticipate or design such responses farther in advance than the current or following year. The difficulties in planning are

related to the comparative short-term nature of research projects, service activities, and determination of teaching loads in colleges of education. Their missions must be given a longer view. Our five-year plans, for example, were disappointingly inadequate for determining what needed to be done and anticipating time-consuming steps along the way.

7. University interpretations of opportunity conflict with the realities and characteristics of effective collaborative actions. A major interest of the university in our collaborative activities was the opportunity "to increase the applicant pool." More contacts between the college of education and potential students would lead to more degree-oriented students taking university courses. It was a matter of money. As grateful as we were for such interest, however, it could not be returned in kind. Course work and degree orientation were counterproductive when it came to responding effectively to the professional development needs of school teachers and other educators. We relate the absence of money for staff development programs within our colleges of education to the interpretations of opportunity, given current missions and responsibilities. The lack of materials and resources needed to improve the professional development of teachers reflects the status and attitudes that colleges of education, as members of universities, hold for educators in the school. Some colleges of education appear to function as if the value of faculty and school administrators is no more than their potential as students. Resources such as the university library are off-limits to teachers unless they are official university students. Such attitudes and policies would not be altered easily without a corresponding reform of the missions and responsibilities of the college of education.

Restrictions Caused by School District Operating Procedures

This third list refers to barriers we experienced because of the policies of schools and school districts. This is a relatively short list with a few critical items. The brevity of this final list probably indicates that local schools and school districts have a tradition of working with outside consultants. The conditions for successfully improving the professional development of teachers, however, do strain certain comfortable consultative procedures and the job definitions of teachers. The following are restrictions in operating procedures that our experience suggests must be reformed if collaborative actions are to become more natural.

1. Once the school board determines categories for spending, the categories cannot be altered without returning to the board. As innocuous as funding categories' restrictiveness might seem, it became a major barrier to our efforts to respond to local staff development problems. The dynamic changes in anticipated categories for spending in the types of resources needed (e.g., people rather than materials, released time rather than consultants) were difficult to accommodate within local school policies. Once the school board had budgeted a categorical sum, it could not be changed without the board's authorization.

2. Although it is natural and reasonable for collaborative efforts to follow the hierarchical chain of command, we found most school administrators unprepared for discussions on the professional needs of teachers. Staff

development seldom was an area covered in administrators' experience or prior education. This made it difficult for school administrators to apply the leadership required by their positions of authority to consider the institutional and educational contexts of teachers and teaching in serious terms. Without administrative leadership at the school district level, the institutional involvement and cooperation required were not present. Even if oral agreements could be reached with administrators for personal collaborative actions to occur, the institutional nature of collaboration could not be pursued. Attempts to address professional development problems by redesigning the work conditions of teachers were thwarted, although not so much by administrative strategy as by administrative ignorance. We fault administrators' lack of appropriate education and training.

3. The time and expectations for teachers to participate in collaborative efforts were not in their bargaining contracts. Analysis, planning, and dialogue all take time, and such time was not allowed for in teachers' job descriptions and expectations. If meetings were scheduled after school or on the weekend, they conflicted with requirements of union contracts; if they were scheduled during school, they conflicted with the district expectations of full-time teaching. Flexibility was required of all--individual teachers, the union, the school district, and the university--in responding to the barriers resulting from job definitions and expectations of teachers. A greater range of expectations and more institutional flexibility in the job definitions of teaching would have helped our efforts considerably. The irony of this situation cannot escape us. The work conditions of teachers must be improved, at least to the extent of their job definitions, before the work and the work conditions of teachers can be addressed fully through collaboration.

4. Standing committees of teachers within the schools were not always helpful. Although formed to represent teachers in developing policies toward their local work situations, we found standing committees to be so mired in an adversarial stance with school administrators that the committees were unable to discuss a range of staff development responses to their own conditions. The way these groups responded to professional problems made dialogue and the ncessary give-and-take of planning and development difficult. Because of their attitudes, we found it necessary to form separate committees of teachers to discuss and resolve professional development problems within the schools.

5. Collaborative actions required more flexibility than school operating procedures and teacher contracts allowed. Professional problems were not resolved with inflexible plans and procedures, as the solutions often changed the circumstances, making the continuing education of teachers through collaboration a dynamic process. Actions and resources actually used were often different from those initially anticipated and planned. Just as Roberta changed our approach to the teachers' work conditions in her high school, we found that involving ourselves with teachers and addressing their work and context would alter the materials, resources, individuals, and institutional support needed. Operating procedures in schools must allow for adjustments in planning just as they must in colleges of education.

CHAPTER EIGHT

LESSON FOUR
EDUCATIONAL MISSIONS AND WORK RESPONSIBILITIES MUST BE REDISTRIBUTED

LESSON FOUR: Missions and responsibilities of colleges of education and schools must be redistributed if the professional development of educators is to be improved

Some restrictive operating procedures can be changed fairly easily, but many barriers to collaboration result from how the missions of the institutions have been drawn and the consequent organizational work defined. Until teachers are expected to talk among themselves, design curricula, and inquire into their own practices and contexts, and until professors are expected to be more locally oriented, the chances for meaningful (and lasting) reform in the professional development of educators will be slim. The more we analyzed our experiences in collaboration to improve professional development, the more we realized that fundamental missions and responsibilities would need to be redistributed between colleges of education and schools. Such reforms may take considerable time and public dialogue.

The following reviews the distribution of missions and responsibilities in seven educational areas, and discusses what could be done to distribute these missions more equitably and rationally. These areas include: (a) teaching--who does it and what is taught; (b) educational management and leadership--how educational decision makers and educational goals are determined; (c) inquiry, research and dialogue--who creates better understanding about the teaching and learning process, and how; (d) the communication of educational experience, understanding, and scientific lessons; (e) educational problem solving--how specific educational puzzles are confronted and resolved; (f) participation with the public--how the public is involved in the education of the young; and (g) curricular design--who determines the form, focus, structure, and sequence of subject matter and educational style. Our discussions of the seven areas are necessarily brief. Of importance is that the distribution of mission and responsibility determines too many of the educational problems in schools and restricts too many of the educational solutions to these problems.

Current Missions and Responsibilities

Teaching. The mission of the school is to teach children and youths. Educators who work in schools are given responsibilities deemed necessary to perform that mission. Schools are judged ultimately on the extent to which children are taught.

Colleges of education teach those who teach. Undergraduates are student teachers who receive a teacher's certificate along with a bachelor's degree. Teachers can enroll as graduate students in colleges of education, and their pay is increased and degrees earned. Researchers are educated in colleges of education, as are educational administrators and other specialists.

Educational leadership. Educational leadership in the schools is defined by hierarchical position. By mission and responsibility, administrators manage the school, but many decisions rest with elected school board members. Local contracts negotiated with teacher unions become features of school policy (e.g., in terms of hours, time for professional development, specific responsibilities, seniority rights). This bureaucratic and institutional definition of leadership in educational matters is troublesome for schools, as management is focused on institutional rather than on educational matters. Within an administrator's background, training, experience, and institutional reward, educational issues are seldom considered. They are not as essential to institutional survival as order, bureaucratic rationality, and a public image of performance (see Meyer & Rowan, 1977).

In colleges of education, leadership for collaborative activities with teachers is idiosyncratic and eclectic. Educational leadership, when it is exercised in colleges of education, is usually seen in an occasional university professor with an idea, the time, and the entrepreneurial energy to pursue it. The development of educational goals and strategies for collaboration is secondary to the academic responsibilities of college of education professors. Such educational leadership seldom is focused on individual schools, even less often is performed by those who train the administrators. Within most colleges of education, professional distinctions are made between the department of educational administration and other departments in the college of education.

Inquiry. Almost no inquiry is conducted in schools by school personnel. Except for a few members of central offices in large school districts (responsible for designing and analyzing test scores), there is no mission or responsibility for analysis, inquiry, or educational investigation by school personnel. Professional dialogue is not expected, rewarded, or esteemed. Curiosity about the educational process in general, or about the ironies and contradictions in an individual's actions in particular, fall outside of formal school roles. Little information exists upon which to make management decisions. If program, school, or individual evaluations are to be made, schools usually hire outside experts.

The mission for inquiry, for building a formalized understanding of educational processes and contexts, clearly is found in colleges of education and federally funded research centers. Although some have criticized the productivity and actual responsiveness of college of education faculty to this academic responsibility, research is stated as a major institutional mission. In terms of reward and performance, such activities are performed as autonomous, independent, and individualistic actions, and often educational specialists from one institution feel a closer professional kinship with their counterparts from other institutions than with their own colleagues. Dialogue occurs, if at all, between individuals from distant institutions with a shared professioanal field; it seldom occurs within a college of education. This idiosyncratic, specialist focus of educational inquiry away from local conditions and toward a community of specialists is becoming more prevalent.

As a consequence, educational inquiry is becoming more technically and scientifically proficient, but less oriented to local circumstances and actions.

Professional communication. Neither by mission nor by responsibility is communication of professional experience, acquired understandings, or scientific investigation expected from schools. A few populist journals are available for brief descriptions of "tricks of the trade" and some schools publish local newsletters that allow minimal space for teachers to report, but these opportunities are neither rewarded nor expected. School educators are less productive as writers now than they were 75 years ago (Fox & DeVault, 1978).

Colleges of education have the academic responsibility for publication and professional communication. Journal articles, chapters in edited anthologies, reference books, monographs, and textbooks, as well as other educational materials are prized, rewarded, and expected of the college of education professor. Professional communication is a mission of the college of education and a responsibility of the individual professor. With an expansion of opportunity presented by more refereed educational journals and a new generation of academic entrepreneurs, academic productivity from colleges of education is increasing.

Problem solving. Educational problem solving is a managerial responsibility. Whether institutional administrators or public critics of an institution have identified a problem, the plans and responses are expected to be directed by certain school managers. Frequently, the design of a response becomes the responsibility of a contacted third party hired as a consultant specialist; these experts usually come from a college of education.

Lower echelons in the school hierarchy (teachers, for example) are seldom used in local school problem solving. The uniqueness of teacher involvement is demonstrated by the published narratives of such attempts and by the fact that such activities usually occur in the summer when teachers do not teach, or in the school year when they are specifically released from their duties. Local problem solving is not a teacher's job responsibility. Educational problem solving is seldom a responsibility of the educators closest to the problem, which leaves many solutions symbolic, unperformed, or misdirected.

Although colleges of education may claim "public service" to be a mission and an academic responsibility to solve local educational problems, it is clear that individuals do this in response to local initiative. It is a consultative, entrepreneurial activity performed by faculty members. They are chosen because of encounters--almost by chance--between individuals, or because of their reputations built from national publications or research, but not in solving local problems.

Public communication. Communicating with the public is a managerial responsibility, sometimes carried out by public relations specialists. These communications are seldom substantial and are rarely sensitive to professional problems. The public is informed for approval and support, not for critical debate on educational issues, except in the higher levels of district policy making. From one perspective, the public is viewed as the antagonist to professional performance; from another perspective, as a potential supporter needing a little explanation to support worthy professional plans. Seldom, however, is the view held that the public can contribute to and help redirect

school goals through dialogue and planning educational practices.

In many ways these perspectives are the result of the missions and responsibilities as they are drawn up by the schools. Citizen involvement is defined by the actions of representative school board members. Certain members in the school bureaucracy are responsible for reporting, listening, and responding to school board members (or to dissatisfied citizens). At the school level, an administrator has this responsibility, which makes communicating with the public an administrative task, not a professional educator's responsibility. Teachers are expected to report achievement scores, a process that is explained, not debated, if discussions with parents and parent groups ever get that far. As Elliott (1982) has shown (and this is further supported by our experience), it takes time to train educators if they are to engage the public in serious educational dialogue.

As limited as public communication is in public schools, it is far ahead of any by colleges of education. Yet ironically, communication to the public on issues of educational practice comes from college of education professors in the form of expert studies reported through the mass media. Note that the form is neither discourse nor dialogue. Basically, there is no mission nor set of responsibilities for colleges of education to communicate with the public and no experience with public dialogue. The communication occurs as that of an expert informing the public through a medium, and the intent is to enhance the professional image and reputation of the professor, particularly, and of the profession more generally.

Curricular design. Curricular design is big business. By mission and responsibility, schools leave the practice, planning, and production of curricular design to profit-making corporations. Schools are primarily consumers and have little involvement in developing text materials and organizing subject matter. Instead, some school representatives draw guidelines upon which committees choose the most attractive or representative set of prepackaged materials. Professional responsibilities of most school people (and nearly all teachers) seldom include the design of their own curriculum and their own materials. Except for occasional summer workshops, those teachers who do take such initiative do so either in conflict with administrative policy or with no professional reward.

Education professors, on the other hand, are the producers of curricula. This is done on an individual basis where the entrepreneurial skills of the autonomous faculty member are rewarded by contracts with manufacturers of textbooks and instructional materials. Curricular design is also a college of education mission, which makes liaisons between faculty members and manufacturers doubly lucrative. From the perspective of the college of education faculty member, curricular design is a professionally autonomous activity. From the perspective of the college of education, curricular design is a skill developed and supported because of college of education affiliation. From the perspective of the manufacturer, it is a large team activity with many of the crucial specialists on the manufacturer's payroll.

A direct link between a college of education faculty member and a manufacturer of mass curricula not only is formed by opportunity (and skill), but also is supported by mission and responsibility. In such subjects as reading and mathematics, the link between educational consumer and producer is extremely close. The faculty producers of the textbooks and tests that determine mathematics and reading curricula also train the teaching consumers in the name of academic scholarship. The power of reading textbooks and tests

on the elementary school curriculum has been demonstrated to be especially strong. This power is generally maintained and supported by the missions and responsibilities drawn by colleges of education.

Summary of Current Missions and Responsibilities. Missions and responsibilities of colleges of education and schools as now drawn simply cannot support collaborative efforts to improve the professional development of educators, especially teachers. Occasional efforts like ours, supported by external Teacher Corps funds, can survive and be successful for a time. Also, some barriers to interactive activities between colleges of education and schools can be reduced by altering certain operating procedures in the respective institutions. In general, however, when we contrast the missions and responsibilities of schools with those of colleges of education, we arrive at too many conflicts of interest in matters critical to improving professional development and necessary for interactive actions.

The current distribution of mission and responsibility between colleges of education and schools creates a dichotomy of teacher versus educational expert. This dichotomy points to the need for redistributing educational opportunity among educators, but it also restricts the capacity of educators to address this need through interactive dialogue, planning, and design. When one party has the responsibility for research, inquiry, educational investigation, and professional dialogue, and the other has very little responsibility for rational reconsideration of work, procedural principles, or professional understanding and performance, then interactive involvement is hollow for the second party.

Many conflicts are created by current distributions of responsibility and institutional mission. These conflicts include: the curriculum producer vs. curriculum user; the curriculum vs. instruction; administrator vs. teacher vs. researcher; professional accountability vs. public accountability; and action research vs. conceptual inquiry vs. empirical research. Consequences of current distributions of mission and responsibilities within educational institutions include the lack of congruence teachers experience between curricular design and educational practice; the intercurricular disjunctions now made (e.g., between mathematics and science, between social studies and literature); the intellectual atrophy and corresponding stressfulness of teaching; the deep professional frustrations of many of the best teachers; the animosities between teachers and administrators, teachers and teachers, teachers and researchers; the professional communication of educational specialist to educational specialist; and the proposed mediators between researchers of teaching and teachers. Such conflicts restrict the possibilities that collaboration between colleges of education and school districts can improve the professional development of teachers. Revision of the institutional missions and work responsibilities that have caused these conflicts clearly is required.

Redistributed Missions and Responsibilities

Specific missions and responsibilities of colleges of education and schools could be shared, thereby making opportunities for local educational improvement more natural and expected. If the current delineations of responsibilities and missions for teaching, inquiry, leadership, and curricular design were arranged more flexibly, educators in schools could

participate in and be rewarded for these actions. A consequent reformation of educational circumstances of both teacher and professor may be expected. Other missions and responsibilities could be rearranged so that staff development problem solving and public communication might be addressed more directly and effectively.

The variety of possible changes in institutional mission and professional responsibility is limited only by our imagination. The following are some possible redistributions of currently defined missions and responsibilities that might produce enriched professional development of teachers and more substantial interactions between them and other educators.

Teaching. Teaching the young could become a mutual mission shared between colleges of education and schools. Teaching children could be one of the responsibilities for some college of education professors. Just as critical, schools could share the mission of teaching teachers, student teachers, administrators, and educational researchers. Distinctions between the missions of teaching educators and teaching children could be reduced, and educational experiences could be created that are not organized by degree or course requirements. Opportunities to learn outside of university time and process restrictions could be enhanced. More interaction could be expected between teaching and thought; between inquiry into teaching and the practice of teaching; and among teaching teachers, teaching students, and educational research. Job definitions, expectations, and rewards could reflect a wider range of teaching-related responsibilities than is now the case within colleges of education and schools. Opportunities for educational advancement could be commensurate with these added teaching responsibilities, and a range of teaching missions could be redistributed and shared between colleges of education and schools.

Educational leadership. Leadership could be encouraged directly within schools with more training and experience in professional development being required and rewarded. Greater analysis of educational excellence and its consequent rewards could stimulate leadership, offering opportunities for a wider variety of staff development positions where teaching, analysis, and curricular design could be line positions in educational institutions.

Colleges of education could emphasize educational leadership within their institutional settings, with a wider range of involvement of school educators and closer connections among departments. Colleges of education, rather than individual faculty, could become more involved in local circumstances; for example, colleges could take more responsibility for addressing educational excellence, for educating school leaders, and for widening the educational opportunities for school educators by sharing missions, such as research, inquiry, and the education of educators. There could be more institutional linkages between colleges of education and schools.

In general, we suggest a tightening of leadership responsibilities within colleges of education, a focusing of leadership on staff development in schools, and more institutional interactions between schools and colleges of education to enhance professional development.

Inquiry. Professional investigations could become a mission of schools and a professional responsibility of those who teach, emphasizing teaching and learning practices and locally identified educational problems. The empirical nature of these inquiries could contribute to research for the profession at

large or as action-oriented studies emphasizing individual reading, philosophy, and understanding about educators' thematic or theoretical work--much of it self-reflective.

There would be more emphasis in colleges of education on team investigations and inquiries integrating a variety of thematic, conceptual, and theoretical orientations. Inquiries could be based upon educational principles, focused on educational actions, and directed toward the restructuring of educational contexts, leading to results that are illuminative rather than conclusive. (Similar suggestions have been made by Campbell, 1975; Chronbach, 1975; Parlett & Hamilton, 1976; Stake, 1978.)

In general, many of these suggestions for reforming educational inquiry imply a loosening up of the authority, responsibility, and opportunities now enjoyed solely by colleges of education. School educators likewise could be enriched by the experiences of inquiry and the demands for action that accompany an increase in understanding one's work.

Professional communication. If the communication of professional thought, reflection, analysis, and empirical inquiry becomes a school's mission and a school educator's responsibility, then more teachers' extensive descriptions of educational practices, thought, and reflection would have to be included in the professional literature. Along with providing opportunities for local educators to publish, this would offer greater expectations of more professional and occupational rewards for communicating their inquiries and reflections on teaching. Just as important as the support and time for literate productivity would have to be corresponding support and time allotted to teachers for reading and thinking about others' work.

Included in these opportunities for professional communication would be opportunities and expectations for professional dialogue and debate within the school setting and at professional conferences. Colleges of education could be involved with schools in providing professional support and resources to make it possible for professional communication to be carried out by school educators. More significantly, an emphasis on the school's responsibility for public communication would probably mean less personal authority by certain college of education professors in short, challenging some college of education interests.

Problem Solving. Educational problem solving needs more institutional and professional attention. Identifying and resolving particular circumstances that impinge upon the educational quality experienced by school children require integration of the actions of educators with different specialties and perspectives. Our experience in problem solving convinced us that greater attention must be placed on focusing institutional missions and professional roles toward the resolution of teachers' educational challenges. At this time, too much is being omitted from the professional responsibilities and expectations of school educators. Increasing their responsibilities for problem solving would require greater institutional support of time and rewards, as well as opportunities for planning, inquiry, and dialogue. This kind of involvement must be expected, appreciated, and supported if a school's educational problems are to be resolved by its educators.

Colleges of education can be of assistance, but only if they realistically can train educators to participate effectively in school problem solving. Our experiences suggest that the professional separation of colleges of education from schools sometimes can be applied usefully in collaborative

efforts. Nevertheless, schools must take more institutional and professional responsibility for solving the educational problems they encouter.

Too often educational problems are approached as obstacles within an educational system that generally works. Instead of being understood as fundamental problems created by current distributions of educational missions and responsibilities, they are understood and addressed as idiosyncratic glitches in an otherwise smooth-running machine. From this view, a temporary mechanic (e.g., college of education consultant) would suffice.

To realize that educational problems are transformed when initiatives are taken by school educators reinforces our view that local "communities of competence" must be developed if educational problems are to be handled effectively. Suggestions for the function and form of these educational communities of competence are plentiful. They include educationally inspired descriptions of action-research enterprises (e.g., Elliott, 1982), inquiry-oriented local teams (e.g., Florio, 1979), or policy-directed investigations (e.g., Fenstenmacher, 1980).

From our perspective, many educational problems--problems in the education of educators--are fundamental features of the educational process. Once educational institutions and professional educators include this kind of problem solving as an essential educational mission and responsibility, our efforts can be more effective. Over the years, we have learned how natural the education of educators would be if both colleges of education and schools acknowledged problem solving as a major mission of their respective institutions and directed some of their resources and personnel accordingly.

Public communication. Communication with the public is another substantive educational challenge that needs to be recognized and addressed by all educators and all educational institutions. The misleading rhetoric and professional isolation from the public enterprise have had beneficial consequences for educators at both colleges of education and schools, even though they resulted in detrimental consequences to public education. As Meyer and Rowan (1977) have shown, the ambiguous and misleading rhetoric of educators protects their institutions from public scrutiny as it defends their professional status. That is why this reform, more than any other, probably would be most difficult to initiate. It may be considered too risky to share the ambiguous and complex nature of educational practice and policy with an impatient, potentially unappreciative and critical public. It is our view, however, that this mission can be taken much more seriously by both colleges of education and schools. Responsibilities might be drawn in educational terms based upon the public's right to know, rather than the use of bureaucratic terms based upon the protection of public institutions.

To prepare for, initiate, and maintain pubic dialogue on substantive educational issues, this mission would have to be shared between colleges of education and schools. Public communication must become a major responsibility of practicing educators in both institutions. Communication would also have to focus on educational practice, rather than on local administrative policy. Much remains to be done to prepare educators in working with the public. In general, however, communication with the public seldom has been performed by educators because of the ways in which educational missions and responsibilities have been interpreted and distributed within the education professions.

Curricular design. Current consumer-producer distinctions of curricular

design can be softened by redistributing specific missions and responsibilities of colleges of education and schools. More attention, for example, can be placed on school educators' adaptation of curriculum and involvement in curriculum development. At best, some teachers have designed curriculum in the summer with minimal pay and no interaction with college of education or curriculum industry personnel. It is treated as amateur's work outside of the teaching role, rather than as an integral feature of the teaching profession.

Curricular design can become a school mission, shared perhaps with a college of education. Further, this mission could be linked to educational inquiry with more serious attention given to the role of curricular design in educational leadership, supported by wider teaching responsibilities. More attention could also be placed by school missions on the curriculum of all educators' training, providing greater opportunities for local educators to become involved in the design of the education of student teachers, teacher educators, and educational researchers. When the professional redistribution and integration of mission and responsibility occur, greater attention also might be placed upon public communication and wider citizen involvement in the process. Education will be a healthier profession when curricular design becomes a dynamic local action performed by confident, inquiring, and informed educators in a public forum of dialogue and debate. Further, educators will have more to contribute to students and to society at large.

Summary of reforms. If teaching, inquiry, leadership, and curriculum design were reconstructed as more shared missions between colleges of education and schools, collaborative actions would have more substance and the professional development of all educators would be improved. Without more integration of professional missions and responsibility, collaboration among educators will be heroic efforts resulting in relatively small gains toward the improvement of the education experienced by children.

In addition to lessening the current distinctions between colleges of education and schools in some areas, we suggest intensifying the focus of missions elsewhere. Educational problem solving and communicating with the public must be emphasized within colleges of education and schools. Responsibilities must be delineated, supported, and rewarded so that these missions of public education will not be left unattended.

A final point is that the reforms we have suggested would not necessarily reduce the conflict between educators nor obliterate all the problems of education, but they would change the nature of the conflict and the focus of the problems to be encountered. The new conflicts, for example, between localized inquiries and generalized (accumulative) inquiries would take education in a more constructive direction, for these conflicts relate to fundamental educational issues rather than to institutional circumstances.

For those who work in colleges of education and schools, certain occupational problems such as intellectual atrophy, frustration about the lack of educational opportunity, or cynicism created by the unrelated nature of curricular design and classroom action could be replaced. New occupational problems of a healthy educational profession might include having too much to know and understand, too many interesting possibilities to pursue in education, or too many conflicting forms of curricular designs. If these were the problems to be addressed through collaborative actions among educators from different institutions, the education experienced by children would be enhanced.

CHAPTER NINE

LESSON FIVE
THE FOUR LESSONS MUST BE COMBINED INTO AN EFFECTIVE STRATEGY

> LESSON FIVE: The four lessons must be combined into an effective strategy to improve the professional development of educators through collaborative actions.

If educators are serious about reforming professional development through collaborative efforts, then the four lessons must be applied simultaneously. We must install a new staff function, the venture educator, who will be responsible for initiating, mediating, and administering the resources and procedures necessary to resolve staff development issues. We must reduce the institutional restrictions created by the operating procedures of colleges of education, schools, and school districts. We must redistribute and reassign the missions and responsibilities of colleges of education and schools so that cooperation can become a more natural part of all educators' professional lives, especially as they affect the educational experiences of children and youths.

Applying any of these lessons alone would not reform staff development. As much as we would like the venture educator role installed in regions around the country, our experience predicts that if that were the only change, the desired results would be frustratingly evasive. Changing certain procedures within colleges of education and schools alone will not attract their members to collaborative work. Reconstructing missions and responsibilities of colleges of education and schools needs additional enlightenment from experience before the changes in mission can alter effectively the current counterproductive distribution of work between colleges of education and schools. In planning for a better future, no single lesson is sufficient; all four are related and need to be applied together.

Although a variety of possible strategies may be designed to combine actions, it is necessary for all strategies to have: (a) a long-range plan of action, (b) a combination of applying our four lessons simultaneously, and (c) a decided increase in the effort expanded to perform these actions.

We recommend devising long-range plans of 10 or more years if educators are serious about improving professional development of teachers and other school educators. In our Teacher Corps projects, worked with five-year plans and found the time too short to accomplish much that needed to be done to integrate our efforts into the colleges of education and schools with which we worked. Within this time we could solve most of the individual problems and accomplish specific tasks that we set out to understand and address, but we could not expect to reform the educational contexts that created and fostered the problems--and will continue to foster similar problems. Addressing the

professional development of teachers and other educators requires more time, more critical institutional attention, and more effort.

A 10-year plan for combining our four lessons would begin by noting the need for personal and institutional collaborative actions, then would indicate how relative levels of effort could be placed on three separate actions: (a) implementing a venture educator position, (b) reducing institutional restrictions, and (c) reconstructing institutional missions and responsibilities. Level of effort, which refers to the personnel, money, time, resources, and professional attention devoted to each of these actions, would fluctuate for the three actions over the 10 years of this plan.

Different amounts of emphasis could be placed on each of the recommended actions over time. In addition, the plan further implies that the emphasis on each of these lessons is interrelated. As the venture educator position is implemented and institutional barriers to collaboration reduced, for example, more effort can be placed on the reconstruction of institutional missions and professional responsibilities. The venture educator role would be reduced and possible eliminated as institutional restrictions are modified and professional responsibilities reconstructed.

Substantial amounts of efforts are necessary if any significant and lasting improvements are to be maintained in the professional development of educators. We suggest that the total level of effort addressing all four lessons should begin high, build over time, and be reduced in the latter years, but always be maintained well beyond current efforts to support cooperation between colleges of education and schools. Note, however, that a substantial leap in effort need not be accompanied by large increases in cost. Educators' time, attention, resources, and actions can be taken from current budgets simply by redirecting the professional attention and redefining the work of those within the institutions. If this were a 20-year plan, the pattern might be repeated with cyclical periods of increased effort to improve the professional development of teachers. Any long-range plan requires a commitment to internal change, to the eventual transformation of colleges of education and schools by those who are drawing the plans.

In summary, claims for collaboration are mostly hollow rhetoric to those of us who have cooperated over the years with colleges of education and schools to improve staff development. Because of the barriers we have met, we suggest a role be developed to take responsibility for local collaborative actions. Simultaneously, we advocate altering current procedural and institutional restrictions that make it difficult for collaborative actions among educators in schools and in colleges of education to occur. Although we are skeptical that such collaborative actions will change the work conditions of educators in the schools without major institutional reform, we remain convinced by our experience that when educational opportunities are shared among educators, collaboration can have meaning and improvements in the actual work conditions of teachers can have substance.

REFERENCES

Applegate, J. H. (1981, April). Leadership in staff development: Perceptions of new teacher center directors. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 204 274)

Beers, C. D. (1981, November). Policy frameworks for local action: Lessons from i the Teacher Corps guidelines. Two Volumes. Prepared under contract with the Office of Education, Professional Development and Dissemination Contract number HEW-300-78-0289. Menlo Park, CA.

Berk, L. (1977). What is a good retrospective account? Paper pesented at the annual meeting of the American Eduational Research Association, New York.

Boyer, E. L. (1983). High school: A report on secondary education in America. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. New York: Harper & Row.

Bush, R. N., & Bock, J. C. (1981, October). Institutionalization of educational change: Case studies of Teacher Corps' influence on schools of education. Prepared under contract with the Office of Education Professional Development and Dissemination, Contract number HEW-300-78-0289. Menlo Park, CA.

Bussis, A. M. (1980, April). Collaboration for what? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Bussis, A.; Chittenden, E.; & Amarel, M. (1978, March). Formulations about reading from classroom documentation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto.

Campbell, D. T. (1975). Degrees of freedom (and the case study). Comparative Political Studies, 8(2), 178-193.

Carini, P. F. (1979). The art of seeing and the visibiity of the person. Grand forks, ND: University of North Dakota.

Clark, D. C., & Amoit, M. A. (1981, February). Opportunities for schools of education to foster practitioner involvement in the improvement of teaching. Bloomington, IN.

Corey, S. (1953). Action research to improve school practice. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, Bureau of Publications.

Cronbach, L. (1975). Beyond the two disciplines of scientific psychology. American Psychologist, 30, 116-127.

Deslonde, J. L. (1980, August). Teacher Corps: An implementation study of collaboration and multicultural education. Vol. I. Prepared under contract with the Office of Education and Dissemination, Contract number HEW-300-78-0289. Menlo Park, CA.

Elliott, J. (1976-77). Developing hypotheses about classrooms from teachers' practical constructs. Interchange, 7(2), 2-22.

Elliott, J . (1979). Objectivity, ideology, and teacher participation in educational research. Mimeo. Cambridge, England: Cambridge Institute of Education.

Elliott, J. (1982). Self-evaluation, professional development, and accountability. Mimeo. Cambridge, England: Cambridge Institute of Education.

Elliott, J. (1981). Action-research: A framework for self-evaluation in schools. Mimeo. Cambridge, England: Cambridge Institute of Education.

Elliott, J., & Adelman, C. (1976). Classroom action research. Ford Teaching Project, Unit 2 Research Methods. Norwich, England: Centre for Applied Research in Education, Unviersity of East Anglia.

Elliot, J., & Fox, G. T. (1982, April). Deliberation! Action research! And schools of education? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Elliott, J., & MacDonald, B. (Eds.). (1975). People in classrooms: Teacher evaluations of the Humanities Curriculum Project. Norwich, England: Centre for Applied Research in Education, University of East Anglia, CARE Occasional Publications No. 2.

Emrick, J. A., & Peterson, S. M. (1980, November). School practitioner involvement in the improvement of practice: Review and synthesis. Prepared for Teacher Corps, Development Branch, Department of Education, Contract number 300-79-0670. Los Altos, CA.

Feiman, S. (1979). Technique and inquiry in teacher education: A curricular case study. Curriculum Inquiry, 9(1), 63-79.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1980, September). Teacher personnel policies: A case of inappropriate means to approprite ends. Prepared for the Midwest Policy Seminar, CEMREL, St. Louis.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1980, May). The educative value of research on teaching. Blacksberg, VA: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Florio, D.; Behrman, M.; & Goltz, D. (1979, November-December). What do policy makers think of educational research and evaluation? Or do they? Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1(6), 61-87.

Florio, S. & Walsh, M. (1976, April). The teacher as colleague in classroom research. Paper

presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 179 545)

Fox, G. T., Jr. (1983). Challenging how teachers are educated: A source for dialogue and action. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 228 160)

Fox, G. T., Jr. (1981, April). Can a federal program evaluation be policy relevant, field responsive and professionally illuminative? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles.

Fox, G. T., Jr., & DeVault, M. V. (1978, November). An historical perspective on individualized instruction. Journal of Applied Programmed Learning and Educational Technology, 15(4), 271-283.

Fox, G. T., Jr., & Kaplan, G. (1981). Teacher education and Teacher Corps, 1965-1980. Prepared for Teacher Corps, Contract number 300-77-0156.

Goodlad, J. I. (1983). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Grundy, S., & Kemmis, S. (1981). Social theory, group dynamics and action research. In The professional development of teachers through involvement in action research projects. Victoria, Australia: Deakin University.

Hall, D. A. (1981). Teachers as persons: Case studies of the lives of women teachers. NIE Project number NIE-C-400-79-0051.

Hawkins, D. (1966). Learning the unteachable. In L. Shulman & E. Keisler (Eds.). Learning by discovery: A critical appraisal. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Howey, K. R. (1976). Organization for inservice teacher education: A perspective from higher education. In Issues in inservice education. State action for inservice. Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Howey, K., & Gardner, W. (1982). The education of teachers: A look ahead. New York: Longman.

Joyce, B. (Ed.). (1978). Involvement: A study of shared governance of inservice teacher education. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and the National Dissemination Center (Syracuse, NY).

Kemmis, S. (1980, November). Action research in retrospect and prospect. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Sydney, Australia.

Kemmis, S. (1981, November). Inquiry and action in education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Sydney, Australia.

Lindbolm, C. E., & Cohen, D. K. (1979). Usable knowledge. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Little, J. W. (1981, April). The power of organizational setting: School norms and staff development. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles.

MacDonald, B. (1974). Evaluation and the control of education. In B. MacDonald & R. Walker (Eds.), SAFARI: Innovation, evaluation, research and the problem of control (pp. 8-20). Norwich, England: Centre for Applied Research in Education, University of East Anglia.

MacDonald, B., & Walker, R. (Eds.). (1974). SAFARI: Innovation, evaluation, research and the problem of control. Ford SAFARI Project. Norwich, England: Centre for Applied Research in Education, University of East Anglia.

Melnick, S. L., & Wheeler, C. W. (1983, February). Educational equity and preservice teacher education: A collaborative model project. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Eduation, Detroit.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 83, 340-363.

Moore, D., & Hyde, A. (1978, June). Rethinking staff development: A handbook for analyzing your program and its costs. New York: Ford Foundation.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Olson, P.; Freeman, L.; Bowman, J.; Pieper, J. (Eds.). (1972). The university can't train teachers. A symposium of school administrators discuss school-based undergraduate education for teachers. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Curriculum Development Center.

Orpwood, G. W. F. (1983, April). Deliberative inquiry: A model for curriculum policy study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Parlette, M. & Hamilton, D. (1976). Evaluation as illumination: A new approach to the study of innovatory programs. In Evaluation studies review annual, Vol. I (pp. 140-157). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Peterson, S. M., & Emrick, J. A. (1981, January). Research and reflection: School practitioner involvement in knowledge production as a strategy for professional

development. Prepared for U.S. Department of Education, Contract Number 300-79-6070. Los Altos, CA.

Popkewitz, T.; Tabachnick, R.; & Zeichner, K. (1979, September-October). Dulling the senses: Research in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 30, 52-60.

Reid, W. A. (1979). Practical reasoning and curriculum theory. Curriculum Inquiry, 9(3), 187-207.

Reid, W. A. (1981). The deliberative approach to the study of the curriculum and its relation to critical pluralism. In M. Lawn & L. Barton (Eds.), Rethinking curriculum studies. London: Croom Helm.

Schaefer, R. (1967). The school as a center of inquiry. New York: Harper and Row.

Schwab, J. J. (1978). The practical: A language for curriculum. In I. Westbury & N. J. Wilkhof (Eds.). Science, curriculum, and liberal education (pp. 187-321). University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Smith, D. C. (1982, March). Speaking the language of living (with children): The singing of pedagogy. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Smith, B. O. (1982). A design for a school of pedagogy. U.S. Department of Education Publication No. E-80-42000. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Stake, R. E. (1978). The case study method in social inquiry. Educational Researcher, 7, 5-8.

Stayrook, N. (1981, November). Technical status report on staff development. Prepared for Office of Education Professional Development and Dissemination, Contract No. HEW-300-78-0289. Menlo Park, CA.

Stenhouse, L. (1978). Case study and case records: Towards a contemporary history of education. British Educational Research Journal, 4(2).

Stenhouse, L. (1980). Curriculum research and development in action. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Stenhouse, L. (1979, February 20). Research as a basis for teaching. Inaugural lecture at the University of East Anglia, Norwich, England.

Tom, A. (1980). The reform of teacher education through research: A futile quest. Teachers College Record, 82(1), 15-29.

Tom, A. (1984). Teaching as a moral craft. New York: Longman.

Tucker, S. B. (1981). Increasing the research capacity of schools of education: A policy inquiry (NIE contract No. NIE-G-80-G-80-0161). Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University, School of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 211 453)

Walker, R., & Adelman, C. (1975). A guide to classroom observation. London: Methuen.

Walker, R.; Macdonald, B.; Elliott, J.; & Adelman, C. (1976). Innovation, the school and the teacher. Milton Keynes, England: The Open University Press.

Wise, R. (1977, April). A case for the value of retrospective accounts of curriculum development. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Zeichner, K. M. (1980, November-December). Myths and realities: Field experience in preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 31, 45-55.

Zeichner, K. M. (1979, April). Reflective teaching and field-based experience in teacher education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.